THE REPLIE OF IOHN DARRELL, TO THE ANSWER OF IOHN DEACON, AND *Iohn Walker*, concerning the doctrine of the Poſſeſſion and Diſpoſſeſsion of Demoniakes.

Eccleſiaſtes 4. 1.

I turned, and conſidered all the oppreſsions that are wrought vnder the ſun, and behold, the teares of the oppreſſed, & none comforteth them: and loe the ſtrength is of the hand of them that oppreſſe them, and none comforteth them.

Imprinted 1602.

A659770

TO THE RIGHT REVEREND FATHERS AND BRETHREN,

the Pastors and Teachers in the Church of England, Grace and peace be multiplied in our Lord Iesus Christ.

IT had bene to be wished (right Reuerend & beloued in our Lord Iesus Christ) that some question arising of late, as you know, concerning *Dispossession of diuels in these times by fasting and prayer*, the same might haue bene propounded, examined, and decided in your lawful assembly. For your senses being exercised in the knowledge of God his truth, and your minds enlightened with continuall practise of the Church, would easily haue discerned the stampe of the Sanctuarie: and this iudiciall determination of yours, woulde (no doubt) either haue preuented, or stayed at least much violent proceeding, manie impious assertions, and great distractions among the people, which not able to iudge of the substance of things, stand amazed at the vaine sound and multitude of words. But as this happinesse hath bin much wished in like case heretofore, so neuer could it be lesse hoped for then now, when our sinnes haue breathed new life into the dead carkesse of Antichrist, whereby hee startles vp on his feete afresh, and begins to strout amongst vs againe in terrible sort. yet notwithstanding your ioint consents cannot be had, I thought it meet to offer this Reioynder to your considerations seuerally, holding it most requisite that you the same parties should also heare Truth speake in her iust defence, before whom, and to whom, shee hath beene slaundered most shamefully. But what Truth is able to pleade for her selfe shall more fully appeare in the Treatise following: now onely she craueth, that as *Gregorie Nazianzen* iudged of *Iulian* by the wagging of his head, so by these two Epistles of theirs, one to your selues, the other to the Reader, it would please you to regard of what disposition these Answerers bee.

In their Epistle to you (reuerend brethren) you shall beholde them false in pretence, vntrue in their words, and ridiculously arrogant. For pretence, they make shew of great promptnesse with all humilitie *to submit their opinions to your graue and learned censures*. And who would not esteeme this lowlinesse, as if the men were lately descended from heauen? But alas, they know your pub-

like censure is not to be feared: more waightie occasions haue not hetherto procured it: and what any of you shall pronounce priuately, wil be but one Doctors opinion with them. Their practise makes this plaine in their *Discourses*, where testimonie as cleare as the sunne light alleaged, how the Church both ancient and present hath demeaned her selfe in like actions, they not hauing one word of probabilitie to reply, would shift off the matter with shameless outfacing. Is it likely nowe (worthie Fathers and Brethren) these men would reuerence your authoritie, who reiect without blushing the authoritie of them, whom all the learned deseruedly reuerence? This profession then is but a meere abuse, seruing onely for a maske to hide the deformity of their natural countenance. And as they would carrie a faire colour of that, they neuer purpose to doe, so also they be no lesse vntrue in reporting things alreadie past. They tell you, How *insolently we denied the Christian conference they profered vs*: whereas they neuer profered me any: and as for *M. Moore*, they comming to him, promising to confer the next morning, neuer came to him afterwards: thinking it better to cracke their credit in breaking that promise, then to stand to their word, & receiue a foyle in the bickering. So they talk of *a new conference with me, offered to my speciall friends*: when neither friend nor foe kuew where I was: when also had they knowne, and signified vnto me this profered conference, I might with small securitie to my person haue conferred with them, notwithstanding their profered bond. Whereby you may see that occasion was rather sought to blind the world with, then that any *conference* was soundly intended. In like manner they affirming, that dispossession in these times by fasting & prayer *be miracles*: that they bee vrged as *necessary to support our Religion*: *that there is no difference between them wrought in the church of god amongst vs, & these done in Antichrists kingdom*: *that the dealers, in these actions are to be matched with Brownists & Hackets*: are assertions of such nature as might with good reason, were they true, enrage your meek & patient spirits with indignation: specially whē you heare their principal end in publishing *these Counsels of God lately reuealed vnto them concerning these intricate questions* (for so they speake of these fancies or rather frensies of theirs in the Treatise following) was forsooth to *accomplish the peace of Ierusalem*. Are nouelties peaceable? Innouations fit for quiet? Doctrines neuer heard of before, procurers of concord? O blessed peacemakers, which would soulder vp the breaches and disagreements of Ierusa-

Answer. pag. 95

lem

lem with *latelie reuealed counsels*. Thus they dare to your faces poure forth their vntruths, not onely in matter of faith, wherein none but some speciall persons could conuict them: but also in doctrines, whose falshood your selues are best able of all other to descry as soone as you heare them. And is not their arrogancy worthy to be laughed at (but that your manner is rather to bewaile mens folly) when they would be *Magistri sententiarum*, & haue their Discourses Dictates for young students in diuinitie? It were hansom sure to behold a Sow sit with a distaffe teaching the fine Ladies to spin: that the Crow should instruct the young Nightingales to sing: and that the Conduites in Cheape should be fed from the publike draynes & sinkes of the citie. But could they bee content to be directours only to the younger students? These mysteries of theirs are *an infallible truth*, as they say, *& Counsels of god lately reuealed vnto them*, as you heard euen now. And therfore your selues, learned Fathers, though much trauelled in the sacred sciptures, greatly read in ancient writers, & acquainted with later monuments of knowledge & experience of all kinde, yet hitherto in these poyntes you know nothing: & if you purpose hereafter to vnderstand any thing, you must sucke it onely from the breasts of these *late Reuelations*. In which regarde it may very well bee, these *Answerers* coûld greatly reioyce (as also they professe) if it might please any of you to cõfute them, because they thinke theselues on so sure a ground, & are tickled, as it seemeth with an imagination of that glory, which they suppose they should gaine by your foile & discredit. *W*hether they wil accept such a labour in good part or no, you shall haue experience by this I haue performed. Their former pretences make me to feare this outside of theirs is but ouercast with their wonted perietting.

In the Epistle to the Reader they say that *I haue very vncharitably endeuoured to wound* S. H. (whom els where they call *S. Harsnet vnto death for his dutifull Discouerie*. I maruell they are not ashamed to call it *a dutifull discorerie*, seeing the drift of it is, to proue, *that I taught Sommers to counterfeit*, wherof themselues acquit me, as ye shall heare forthwith. *W*hat *dutie* performed he to God or man, in slaundering the rare workes of god, & his neightbour? Or do they in commending such a Discouerie. It is true that by my *Detection* I endeuoured *to wound S. H. mortally*, so as he should neuer be able to rise vp any more *for counterfeiting & my teaching to counterfeit*: but not with sword, nor speare, onely with the dart of Truth. And I thinke it is as true that I haue *wounded him to death*.

Had not his wounds bene mortall, or at leaſtwiſe incurable, they had beene healed by this, and we had ſeene him the ſecond time in the field. Otherwiſe we muſt deem him for a coward, that encountreth not his enemie being often chalenged. This is the excellency & power of truth that ſhee ſubdueth all thoſe that riſe vp in armes againſt her, & they that take part with her, do at lēgth triūph gloriouſly, as being more thē conquerors. They blame my *pāphlets as full of vnſound & abſurd poſitions*. I wil not confirme in this place, what is els where ſet down, but refer to your Iudgement whether by the former *Survey*, & the following *Reply* it doth not appeare that many *ſuch poſitions* haue iſſued from their owne heads, & that this charge may be turned vpon their owne pates. For *maner*, they charge my writings with *want of Methode*: to bee alſo *ſchiſmaticall* and *Enigmaticall*. Touching the *Methode*, I hope your patience hath beene contented with the order of the *Doctrine*, diuided into three ſeverall branches, & each part proſecuted firſt with reaſons confirming it: & after by remooving ſuch doubtes as might ſeeme to weaken it. And as for *Schiſme*, I teach no Latelie *reuealed counſel, nor my priuate opinion concerning the poſſeſſion & diſpoſſeſſion of diuels*. Both which theſe men confeſſe they do, but what hath ben reuealed and held from the beginning & confirmed euer ſince by cōtinual conſent: whereas if their doctrines be *their owne priuate opinions, and Latelie reuealed*, they bee New. If New, not eſtabliſhed by agreement of Scriptures & the Church: & if not eſtabliſhed, it is *ſchiſme* at the leaſt, for any thing I can conceiue, to publiſh & maintein them. Concerning *Enigmatiall* handling, your owne profiting by reading may beſt be Iudge. It was not my purpoſe, neyther is it my skill to write ridles: Yet becauſe they complaine of darkenes I haue now ſo indeuored my ſelfe, that I hope they may ſpell my meaning, if they put on their ſpectacles. Moreouer they accuſe the *ſpirit wherwith my pamphlets are indited, to be ſenſuall & deuilish*, as giuen to *Rayling, Contradiction, & Diſobedience*. Horrible, indeed is the ſinne of *Rayling*. But iuſt & plaine reprouing with theſe men is raiking: Curing is killing, & whatſoeuer ſmarteth in the ſore, is deadly poyſon. *The morning to the adulterer, is as the ſhadow of death*. The vlcerous patient cryeth out on euery touch of the Chirurgion, as at moſt rough & vnaduiſed handling. It is no meruail if the *Cretians can not endure to be told they are lyars, euil beaſts, & ſlow bellies*: & that ſharpe reproofe be reuiled by ſuch, as altogether intollerable, barbarous, and inhumane. Yet further behold I beſeech you in

Dialog. Diſcourſ. Epiſt. to the Reader in the beginning.

Iob. 24. 17.

Tit. 1. 12.

themselues, how destitute they are of Gods feare in this behalfe: how voyd of the common wisedom of men: & how strongly possessed with that self same itching disease they charge me withall. It is great want of reuerence towards god to defame others fallely, & that against their owne consciences, as they doe me most opprobriously throughout their whole treatises. It is exceeding folly to pro uoke him by forged crimes, which can repay them againe with most true crimes, with publike crimes, with hainous crimes. And is it not an incurable itching which must needes be clawing, till their own flesh be rent from their bones? These mens desire of scratching was so hot, that possibly they could not hold their fingers, though they were guilty to them selues, how deare it might cost them: wherein notwithstanding I haue spared them, being ashamed in playne tearmes to vtter that which they haue not bene ashamed to do. Concerning the *Contradictions* they would thrust vpon me, you will easily perceiue in the *Reply*, how partly they spring from their owne ignorance, as if I cal a thing *Ordinary* and *supernaturall*, then must there needs be a *Contradiction*: partly from their adding, detracting, and changing my words at their pleasure, which they haue done aduisedly and purposely, whereby their sin is increased. And as for *Disobedience by my striuing against the sentence of the High Commission*: is it *a rebellious and vnruly proceeding* according to the commandement & example of Christ Iesus to iustifie the works of god being slaundered, or yet for one to complaine of wrong. For marke I beseech you how in this place they affirming, *that by due order of law wee were conuented, conuicted, apprehended, imprisoned, by sentence of Iustice defintiuely condēned for grosse malefactors, & adiudged to prison*: yet in their *Discourses* haue giuen this testimonie of me, that they did *not so much as suspect any precompacted cōfederacy betweene me and the boy, that all acquainted with my former syncerities and vpright cariage are free from such a perswasion: that the graceles boy did gracelesly counterfet, and my self did only erre in iudgement, and not of any purpose in practise at all*. By the witnes therfore of these mē if the high Cōmission passed any such *sentence* against vs, they did vs open iniury: & I trust oppressed innocents may haue this liberty at least to bewaile their greife. But neither hath the Commission awarded any such sentence, and these men haue done a double notable wrong in slaundering both the Commission, and vs.

To shut vp all, they would hoodwink the reader with their godly iealousie ouer him, pretending they labour to prepaire him for one

Matt. 12. 25. 30.

Dialg. Dis. *pag.* 352.

Had not his wounds bene mortall, or at leaſtwiſe incurable, they had beene healed by this, and we had ſeene him the ſecond time in the field. Otherwiſe we muſt deem him for a coward, that encountreth not his enemie being often chalenged. This is the excellency & power of truth that ſhee ſubdueth all thoſe that riſe vp in armes againſt her, & they that take part with her, do at lēgth triūph glorioully, as being more thē conquerors. They blame my *pāphlets as ful of vnſound & abſurd poſitions*. I wil not confirme in this place, what is els where ſet down, but refer to your Iudgement whether by the former *Survey*, & the following *Reply* it doth not appeare that many *ſuch poſitions* haue iſſued from their owne heads, & that this charge may be turned vpon their owne pates. For *maner*, they charge my writings with *want of Methode*: to bee alſo *ſchiſmaticall* and *Enigmaticall*. Touching the *Methode*, I hope your patience hath beene contented with the order of the *Doctrine*, diuided into three ſeverall branches, & each part proſecuted firſt with reaſons confirming it: & after by remooving ſuch doubtes as might ſeeme to weaken it. And as for *Schiſme*, I teach no Latelie *reuealed counſel, nor my priuate opinion concerning the poſſeſſion & diſpoſſeſſion of diuels*. Both which theſe men confeſſe they do, but what hath ben reuealed and held from the beginning & confirmed euer ſince by cōtinual conſent: whereas if their doctrines be *their owne priuate opinions, and Latelie reuealed*, they bee New. If New, not eſtabliſhed by agreement of Scriptures & the Church: & if not eſtabliſhed, it is *ſchiſme* at the leaſt, for any thing I can conceiue, to publiſh & maintein them. Concerning *Enigmatiall* handling, your owne profiting by reading may beſt be Iudge. It was not my purpoſe, neyther is it my skill to write ridles: Yet becauſe they complaine of darkenes I haue now ſo indeuored my ſelfe, that I hope they may ſpell my meaning, if they put on their ſpectacles. Moreouer they accuſe the *ſpirit wherwith my pamphlets are indited, to be ſenſuall & deuilish*, as giuen to *Rayling, Contradiction, & Diſobedience*. Horrible, indeed is the ſinne of *Rayling*. But iuſt & plaine reprouing with theſe men is raiking: Curing is killing, & whatſoeuer ſmarteth in the ſore, is deadly poyſon. *The morning to the adulterer, is as the ſhadow of death*. The vlcerous patient cryeth out on euery touch of the Chirurgion, as at moſt rough & vnaduiſed handling. It is no meruail if the *Cretians* can not endure to be told they are *lyars, euil beaſts, & ſlow bellies*: & that ſharpe reproofe be reuiled by ſuch, as altogether intollerable, barbarous, and inhumane. Yet further behold I beſeech you in

Dialog. Diſcourſ. Epiſt. to the Reader in the beginning.

Iob. 24. 17.

Tit. 1. 12.

themselues, how destitute they are of Gods feare in this behalfe: how voyd of the common wisedom of men: & how strongly possessed with that self same itching disease they charge me withall. It is great want of reuerence towards god to defame others fallely, & that against their owne consciences, as they doe me most opprobriously throughout their whole treatises. It is exceeding folly to pro uoke him by forged crimes, which can repay them againe with most true crimes, with publike crimes, with hainous crimes. And is it not an incurable itching which must needes be clawing, till their own flesh be rent from their bones? These mens desire of scratching was so hot, that possibly they could not hold their fingers, though they were guilty to them selues, how deare it might cost them: wherein notwithstanding I haue spared them, being ashamed in playne tearmes to vtter that which they haue not bene ashamed to do. Concerning the *Contradictions* they would thrust vpon me, you will easily perceiue in the *Reply*, how partly they spring from their owne ignorance, as if I cal a thing *Ordinary* and *supernaturall*, then must there needs be a *Contradiction:* partly from their adding, detracting, and changing my words at their pleasure, which they haue done aduisedly and purposely, whereby their sin is increased. And as for *Disobedience by my striuing against the sentence of the High Commission:* is it *a rebellious and vnruly proceeding* according to the commandement & example of Christ Iesus to iustifie the works of god being slaundered, or yet for one to complaine of wrong. For marke I beseech you how in this place they affirming, *that by due order of law wee were conuented, conuicted, apprehended, imprisoned, by sentence of Iustice defintiuely condēned for grosse malefactors, & adiudged to prison:* yet in their *Discourses* haue giuen this testimonie of me, that they did *not so much as suspect any precompacted cōfederacy betweene me and the boy, that all acquainted with my former synceritie and vpright cariage are free from such a perswasion: that the graceles boy did gracelesly counterfet, and my self did only erre in iudgement, and not of any purpose in praetise at all.* By the witnes therfore of these mē if the high Cōmission passed any such *sentence* against vs, they did vs open iniury: & I trust oppressed innocents may haue this libertie at least to bewaile their greife. But neither hath the Commission awarded any such sentence, and these men haue done a double notable wrong in slaundering both the Commission, and vs.

Matt. 12. 25. 30.

Dialg. Dis. *pag.* 352.

To shut vp all, they would hoodwink the reader with their godly iealousie ouer him, pretending they labour to prepaire him for one

husband, and to preſent *him as a pure virgin to Chriſt.* But this office
1. *Tim.* 3. belongeth to the Biſhop that is blameles, and is the husband of one wife, &c. as S. *Paul* ſaith. And therfore if the Chriſtiã Reader ſhould looke for grapes from theſe thornes, he ſhould be deceaued. this Epiſtle then to the *Reader* is fraught with the ſame vertues of Cloking, of forging, of pride (though with ſome larger addition) wherwith the former, reuerend Fathers and brethren, was to you. And therefore howſoeuer they thinke, I wil anſwere them as *Hildebrand* did, *Abbas Caſinenſis, frater nimium tardaſti: Deere brethren, you haue beene ſomewhat too ſlow* in publiſhing your *Dialogicall Diſcourſes*: yet I doubt not, but both you, and I, will with one conſent, rather returne the contrarie to them, *Et vos Diſputatores nimium feſtinaſtis: And you, O Diſcourſers, haue made too much haſte.* For had you trauelled as long, as the Elephant in bringing forth her young, yet the birth of ſuch monſtrous deuiſes, ſo ignorant, ſo erroneous, ſo ſlaunderons, ſo impious, had bene abortiue, vntimely, and too ſoon: For this cauſe I haue dealt more roundly and freely with them, then otherwiſe I would haue done with ordinarie men. They could not poſsibly be wakened out of ſo ſtrong an Apoplexie, but by burning feathers and ſhoo-ſoles vnder their noſes: neither would the Reader haue bene ſufficiently warned to eſchew their fraud, except the trumpet had ſounded ſhrill in his eares.

And whereas ſome of you, reuerend and beloued brethren, affirming, and verie truly, that their bookes were vnworthy the anſwering, did thereupon earneſtly diſſwade me from writing: I an-
Tit. 1. 10. ſwere, So alſo was the doctrine of thoſe *vaine talkers, Paul* mentioneth to *Titus*, vnworthy to be confuted, yet the Apoſtle ſaith, *Their mouthes muſt be ſtopped.* And how? by *conuincing*, as there followeth.
Matt. 12. 24. What could be more palpablie falſe, then that of the Phariſees, *Hee caſteth out diuels, through Beelzebub the Prince of diuels?* Notwithſtanding our Sauiour did conuince thē. Euen ſo did *S. Peter* thoſe who
Act. 2. 13 *mocked*, and ſaid the Apoſtles *were full of new wine*, when the holy Ghoſt in that wonderful maner fel vpon them. In priuate communication, *A foole is to be anſwered according to his folly*: but if in publike among the preſſe, in the higheſt places of the citie, or entrings of the gates, where wiſdomes voice ſhould be heard, a foole chance to babble, and vtter that is dangerous to the ſimple, which theſe *Diſcourſers* haue done, then is the folly of a foole to bee throughly diſcouered, and layd open to the viewe of all men. *The fooliſh* (of
Pro. 14, 15 which number are the moſt) *will beleeue euery thing*, be it neuer ſo

falſe, be it neuer ſo abſurd, neuer ſo ſottiſh & ridiculous, ſpecially if it be countenanced with Authority, as are the *Dialogcall Diſcourſes*. For this reaſon, euen to keepe the ſimple from error, who are ſo eaſilie ſeduced, notwithſtanding the vnworthines of theſe *Diſcourſes*, there is cauſe ſomething ſhould be layd in anſwere vnto them, by my ſelfe or other. Neither doe I doubt but theſe my rude lines will (by the bleſsing of God) be effectuall to recouer thoſe which through their verbal writings be faine from the truth, to ſtrengthen ſuch as be wauering, and to ſtabliſh them which more firmely hold the truth. If this ſucceſſe follow, I ſhall haue no cauſe to repent me of my paines, nor any other to account the ſame ſuperfluous.

Now therfore, brethren, I beſeech you know theſe diſturbers, be not deceiued by their ouercalling and ſmoothing. Examine what they ſay, before ye beleeue them. And albeit your authority is not able to bridle them (the more is our griefe, and the miſerie of our Church) yet auoid their doctrines in your ſelues, and in your people. I beſeech you alſo, as your occaſions may ſerue, admonith them: that yet in want of a publike degree, they may gather by you ſeuerally what is the iudgement of all, and be therby aſhamed and reclaimed, if ſo the Lord in mercy pleaſe. Litle needes ſuch conflict in theſe times wherin that antichriſt of Rome extremely rageth, as now entring his laſt triall. But we muſt haue fightings without, and feares within: open wars with the preiſts and Ieſuites, the ſeruants of Antichriſt, and many priuate grieuances by ſuch as would bee counted of the houſhold of faith. It behooues vs therefore brethren, to put on the armor of righteouſnes on the right hand, & on the left, that we may manfully defend & mainteine the holy truth in all her bounds & limits vnuiolated & ſyncere where by the puritie of Religion may ſtill bee continued, and all errour abandoned frō anoying either vs or our poſteritie after vs. The god of mercy, peace and truth confirme and eſtabliſh our heartes, that we may fight the good fight, like good ſoldiers of Ieſus Chriſt, and quit our ſelues like men: holding faith & a good conſcience, to the glory of his name, & euerlaſting comfort of our owne ſoules, through Ieſus our Lord and onely Sauiour. Amen. 2. Cor. 7. 5. 2. Cor. 6. 7

Your fellow ſeruant in the worke of
the Goſpell.

Iohn Darrell.

husband, and to preſent *him as a pure virgin to Chriſt.* But this office
1. *Tim.* 3. belongeth to the Biſhop that is blameles, and is the husband of one wife, &c. as S. *Paul* ſaith. And therfore if the Chriſtiã Reader ſhould looke for grapes from theſe thornes, he ſhould be deceaued. this Epiſtle then to the *Reader* is fraught with the ſame vertues of Cloking, of forging, of pride (though with ſome larger addition) wherwith the former, reuerend Fathers and brethren, was to you. And therefore howſoeuer they thinke, I wil anſwere them as *Hildebrand* did, *Abbas Caſinenſis, frater nimium tardaſti: Deere brethren, you haue beene ſomewhat too ſlow* in publiſhing your *Dialogicall Diſcourſes*: yet I doubt not, but both you, and I, will with one conſent, rather returne the contrarie to them, *Et vos Diſputatores nimium feſtinaſtis: And you, O Diſcourſers, haue made too much haſte.* For had you trauelled as long, as the Elephant in bringing forth her young, yet the birth of ſuch monſtrous deuiſes, ſo ignorant, ſo erroneous, ſo ſlaunderons, ſo impious, had bene abortiue, vntimely, and too ſoon: For this cauſe I haue dealt more roundly and freely with them, then otherwiſe I would haue done with ordinarie men. They could not poſsibly be wakened out of ſo ſtrong an Apoplexie, but by burning feathers and ſhoo-ſoles vnder their noſes: neither would the Reader haue bene ſufficiently warned to eſchew their fraud, except the trumpet had ſounded ſhrill in his eares.

And whereas ſome of you, reuerend and beloued brethren, affirming, and verie truly, that their bookes were vnworthy the anſwering, did thereupon earneſtly diſſwade me from writing: I an-
Tit. 1. 10. ſwere, So alſo was the doctrine of thoſe *vaine talkers, Paul* mentioneth to *Titus*, vnworthy to be confuted, yet the Apoſtle ſaith, *Their mouthes muſt be ſtopped.* And how? by *conuincing*, as there followeth.
Matt. 12. 24. *What* could be more palpablie falſe, then that of the Phariſees, *He caſteth out diuels, through Beelzebub the Prince of diuels?* Notwithſtanding our Sauiour did conuince thē. Euen ſo did S. *Peter* thoſe who
Act. 2. 13 *mocked*, and ſaid the Apoſtles *were full of new wine*, when the holy Ghoſt in that wonderful maner fel vpon them. In priuate communication, *A foole is to be anſwered according to his folly:* but if in publike among the preſſe, in the higheſt places of the citie, or entrings of the gates, where wiſdomes voice ſhould be heard, a foole chance to babble, and vtter that is dangerous to the ſimple, which theſe *Diſcourſers* haue done, then is the folly of a foole to bee throughly diſcouered, and layd open to the viewe of all men. *The fooliſh* (of
Pro. 14, 15 which number are the moſt) *will beleeue euery thing*, be it neuer ſo

falſe, be it neuer ſo abſurd, neuer ſo ſottiſh & ridiculous, ſpecially if it be countenanced with Authority, as are the *Dialogcall Diſcourſes*. For this reaſon, euen to keepe the ſimple from error, who are ſo eaſilie ſeduced, notwithſtanding the vnworthines of theſe *Diſcourſes*, there is cauſe ſomething ſhould be ſayd in anſwere vnto them, by my ſelfe or other. Neither doe I doubt but theſe my rude lines will (by the bleſsing of God) be effectuall to recouer thoſe which through their verbal writings be faine from the truth, to ſtrengthen ſuch as be wauering, and to ſtabliſh them which more firmely hold the truth. If this ſucceſſe follow, I ſhall haue no cauſe to repent me of my paines, nor any other to account the ſame ſuperfluous.

Now therfore, bretnren, I beſeech you know theſe diſturbers, be not deceiued by their ouercaſting and ſmoothing. Examine what they ſay, before ye beleeue them. And albeit your authority is not able to bridle them (the more is our griefe, and the miſerie of our Church) yet auoid their doctrines in your ſelues, and in your people. I beſeech you alſo, as your occaſions may ſerue, admoniſh them: that yet in want of a publike degree, they may gather by you ſeuerally what is the iudgement of all, and be therby aſhamed and reclaimed, if ſo the Lord in mercy pleaſe. Litle needes ſuch conflict in theſe times wherin that antichriſt of Rome extremely rageth, as now entring his laſt triall. But we muſt haue fightings without, and feares within: open wars with the preiſts and Ieſuites, the ſeruants of Antichriſt, and many priuate grieuances by ſuch as would bee counted of the houſhold of faith. It behooues vs therefore brethren, to put on the armor of righteouſnes on the right hand, & on the left, that we may manfully defend & mainteine the holy truth in all her bounds & limits vnuiolated & ſyncere where by the puritie of Religion may ſtill bee continued, and all errour abandoned frō anoying either vs or our poſteritie after vs. The god of mercy, peace and truth confirme and eſtabliſh our heartes, that we may fight the good fight, like good ſoldiers of Ieſus Chriſt, and quit our ſelues like men: holding faith & a good conſcience, to the glory of his name, & euerlaſting comfort of our owne ſoules, through Ieſus our Lord and onely Sauiour. Amen. 2. Cor. 7. 5. 2. Cor. 6. 7

Your fellow ſeruant in the worke of
the Goſpell.

Iohn Darrell.

THE REPLIE TO
THE FIRST DIALOGVE.

IT is a cunning ſleight to beguile the ſimple with, in propounding to ſatiſfy the world for any thing that hath bene ſayd concerning the poynts and parties controuerted wholy to omit the books called the *Triall*, the *Detection*, the *Narration* of ſeuen poſſeſſed in *Lancaſhire*, contayning in them matters of fact, and onely to bend your forces againſt one Treatiſe called *The Doctrine, &c.* The reaſon of which *omiſſion*, Chriſtian Reader, is this. To diſproue things done ſo euidently knowne to ſo many eye-witneſſes were all one as to perſwade that white is blacke, that fire is Ice, that it is dark night in the cleare ſunſhine which whoſo ſhould endeuor would rather be eſteemed of all a mad má, thē gaine any credit to his cauſe. But in points and controuerſies of *doctrine* there was more hope tō deceiue. For here through multitude of words, ambiguons tearmes, fraudulent courſes of reaſoning, falſe coloured ſentences, wreſted and miſtconſtrued ſcriptures, abuſed authorities of famous men, and ſuch other deuiſes, not onely the ignorant & vnable to ſearch the truth ſhould be blinded, but alſo many learned, which before had not weighed theſe thinges, neither perhaps would take the paines to ſift and try them to the proofe, might be ſtriken with ſome amaſe & doubt. Only they whoſe iudgments are ſeaſoned with ſound vnderſtanding, which at firſt ſight are able to diſcerne the crooked writings of peeuiſh and fooliſh ſophiſters, and know without book the ſcope of moſt mens writings in account amongſt the learned, woulde giue true ſentence of the cauſe, and condemne theſe opinions of ignorance and errour. But the number of ſuch is ſmal, and therfore by theſe *Anſwerers* was leſſe regarded. This, whatſoeuer they pretend, was the true ground of their choiſe, yet though they *will not meddle with the Triall, and* Detection, they muſt *bicker a blow or two with the Epiſtles of both.* To let paſſe the diſgraces, wherewith they lade them: for the *Triall* I may ſay (for therof am not I author) I doubt not but iudiciall men wil acknowledge more ſound learning in ſome fewe lines of it, then is in the whole bundle of your fooliſh *Diſcourſes*. To come to that which is material, you charge the *Triall* but with two things, & in this charge make four lies, ſuch is your compendious facultie. Firſt, ſay you, *it matcheth your pre-*

Pag. 3, 9. 10.

Pag. 3.

tended

tended miracle, with the true miracles of Christ. The words of the *Epistle* speaking to the *L. Popham*, bee these, *And concerning as highly the glory of Christ our Saviour, as it doth the credit of a faithfull minister*. Is here any comparison of miracles? Is here any mention of miracles at all? Doth it say any more, but this cause being about a worke done in the name of Christ, doth as highly concerne his glory, as my credit? Again, say you, *the prelats are charged with the sin against the Holy Ghost*. Thus speaketh the Epistle, *that the prelates (which now set themselues against dispossession) be guiltie of this vnpardonable sin, I will not say*. If I will not say, bee I do say, thē the prelats are charged with this sin. Out of this branch spring two other, That you report the Epistle to labour *the L. Chiefe Iustice to recouer himself with speed frō that fearefull sin, wherunto it seemes he is fearefully falling: and that he would reuerse iudgement passed against me*. He which writ the Epistle did not dote, as you do, to entitle his Honour, *an vpright, and worthy*, and *a righteous iudge*, to desire and vrge his Lordship, *to releeue the oppressed innocent*, specially, *to take to heart the slanders giuen out of the works of God*: and within a few lines after to place him in the verie brinke of reprobation. Neither doth he perswade to a *Reuersing of iudgment* (for there was none passed, as the Authour knew well enough) but to a *second hearing, as Felix heard Paul the second time*. Now then let the Reader tell me, if you bee not pithie lyars, that can comprehend so many in so little roome.

Epist. pag. 4.

Pag. 4. Daniels trial in the Epist. pa. 8

For my *Detection* you charge the *Title* as *vndutifull against her Maesties iudiciall proceedings*, for that it is so sharpe against *M. Harsnets* booke. It is more then I knowe, or can beleeue, that her Maiestie commanded *M. Harsnet* to write: or that her Right Hono. Counsell inioined him so much, or that the high Cōmission laid this vpon him. It may be, if his owne vainglorious humor, which euer tooke pleasure to be biting of others, did not prick him forward to this busines, yet that the *B.* his maister, of his priuat authoritie, did set him this taske, to salue his owne credit, and of such as had ioined in disgracing the truth. But I hope one may reprehēd some priuat actions of the *B.* without any vndutifulnes to her maiesties proceedings. You then are malicious pikthanks, which haue nothing in your mouthes, but *Ad leones, ad leones, He is not Cesars friend*.

For the *Epistle*, you charge me *with reviling the B.* I answere, It was not anie contempt or malice towards his person, or forgetfulnesse of any dutie to authoritie, that moued me to such seueritie, as I vsed, but onely feare least otherwise I should haue failed in dutie towards

Pag. 5.

towards God. *Those which sinne*, saith the Apostle, *reproue openly*: And *reproue with all authoritie*. And when I heare *Iohn Baptist* calling the Pharisees *Deceiuers*, and *Generations of vipers*: when I heare our Sauiour most sharply reprouing them by the names of *Persecutors, serpents, generation of vipers, the children of hell, painted sepulchers*, and such like: And S. *Paul* speaking to *Elymas*, *O full of all subtilty, and all mischiefe, the child of the diuell, and enemy of all righteousnesse*: calling also false prophets *Dogges*, and the Cretians *beasts*: yea when I heare *Eliah* call *Ahab, the troubler of Israel*: our Sauiour tearme *Herod a foxe*, *Paul* entituling *Ananias a painted wall*, and *Nero* by the name of a *Lyon*: These and manie such other places of practise, giue me some light for vnderstanding the precept, and teach me, that albeit in my priuate cause I am to vse all mildenesse and gentlenesse, yet when the Lords truth is interessed and slaundered, his greate mercie obscured, and that of purpose and wilfully, neither one *Sergius* by *Elymas* hindered, but manie thousands turned backe from beleeuing his works, from praising him for them, and profiting by them, in this case the man of authority is no lesse to be stricken with the edge of reproofe, then he that is in inferiour place. Nay, rather the publike person, then the priuate man, by how much his example is more dangerous, either forcing or alluring greate multitudes to imbrace his errour. And this doth not hinder but with *Dauid, & Stephen, and our Sauiour himselfe, and all the holy martyrs of God, wee should pray for our persecuters, and blesse them which curse vs*: for reproofe and hatred be not necessarily linked together, but Reproofe is a notable remedie to preserue from hatred, according to that the Lord saith, *Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thy heart, but thou shalt plainly rebuke thy neighbour, and suffer him not to sinne*. But this is your maner, to huddle vp all things in a confused heape together, and that which is spoken with certaine prouisoes and limitations, to alleage it as a bare and simple commaund. Thus much for the Epistles.

1. *Tim.* 5. 20. *Tit.* 2. 15. *Matth.* 3. *Matth.* 23. *Act.* 13. 9. 10. *Philip.* 3. 2. *Tit.* 1, 12. 1. *King.* 18. *Act.* 23. 2. *Tim.* 4. 17. *pag.* 6. *Leuit.* 19. 17.

Yet before you come to the Treatise, you will *admonish the Reader of two cunning sleights of leger demaine, practised by me, throughout that my Pamphlet*: *whereof the first is, That I haue slily ouerslipped what is materiall in M. Harsnets Discouery, as, to make good that distinction of Mirandum & Miraculum, which he hath dashed to nothing*. I answere, that as becommeth true natural Leopards, you cannot change your skinne, but you must needs be lying heere, as almost euerie where else: for I haue replied to M. *Harsnet* out of *Augustine* and *Danæus*,

pag. 7.

Detection, pag. 6. *shewing an apparant difference betweene a Wonder, and a Miracle.* And further haue I answered in suruey of your tenth Dialogue: from whence I pray you tell *M. Harsnet*, that if he remember the difference betweene *Genus* and *Species*, he may feele with his finger that a *Wonder* and a *Miracle* be not all one. And if this will not suffice him, demaund of him, whether Antichrist by the power of Satan worketh not wonders: and whether he esteeme all those wonders to be true miracles. And as touching your selues who accord with *M. Harsnet* herein, what say you to these words of your owne? *The diuell may worke wonders, as Simon Magus hath done: but hee can effect no miracles.* And in another place, *A thing effected by essentiall meanes, howsoeuer it may be a wonder, yet no miracle in any respect.* How can you possibly free your selues here from a contradiction? And this is my reply to your first instance. Againe, say you, *M. Harsnet accusing verie orderly by Sommers testimony, mine owne answers, and seuerall depositions: this his materiall proceeding is pretermitted with silence.* What? haue I written a *Detection of his lying Discouerie*, and haue touched nothing concerning *Sommers testimonie, mine owne answers, and the seuerall depositions?* Then haue I written nothing at all: For there be scarce anie lines in it, which concerne not one of these three. But thereof let the world iudge. I can say no more. I hope I haue shewed how indirect a course it is, that *Sommers* by threats, flatterings and promises of maintenance shoulde first be brought to accuse himselfe, after me, and then to witnesse against me: that mine owne answers should be curtalled, and stretched after the *Discouerers* pleasures: that the depositions which were against their likings should be suppressed, and others published, so far forth, as might giue occasion of doubt to the Reader. What dare not you auouch, which are so bold to affirme that, whereof the contrary appeares in euery mans hand? If your meaning were that in some particular I haue pretermitted this, which your words will not beare, then you should haue done well to haue named that Particular, as the nature of an Instance requireth, which seeing you haue not done, it is thereby plaine, your selues be rather guiltie of *legerdemaine*, then I. Those pages which you quote in the margine, I grant I passed ouer, for that they concerne others, and not my selfe, as also becauſe the matter was friuolous and vnworthy answere, as may there appeare, vrging the being of a thing by no other reason, but because such a thing might be. But marke what a faire threed these men haue spun, and how seeking to discredite

Dialog. pag. 209. & 310.

S. Harſ. Disc. 28. 29.

my

my *Detection*, they haue brought not a *little* credite vnto it. For I will hence proue, that in my *Detection* I haue not let passe *one materiall point of M. Harsnets Discouery* vnanswered: and namely thus. If *Darrell* haue in his *Detection* let goe anie materiall point of the *Discouery* vnanswered, then would the *Discoursers* haue giuen some instances of such omission, where they endeuor to proue the same by instances: But the *Discoursers* instancing to that end, haue giuen not so much as one instance of such omission: Ergo *Darrell* in his *Detection* hath not let goe any one materiall point in the *Discouery* vnanswered.

My second cunning sleight by your saying is, that I *disgrace by all meanes Sommers testimonie, produced against me but extoll it for me, vpholding by it the signes of Possession & Dispossession.* That no credit is to be giuē to his lying testimony, I auouch it indeed in the place by you cited: but where do I *vpholde the signes of possession & dispossession by Sommers his testimonie*, wherewith you charge me? why do not you also cite some place for this? You thought if one part of your assertion were true, the Reader would pardon you for the rest. It is such nouelty for you to speake truth, that any litle is to be accepted at your hands. *pag. 8. 9.*

From the *Epistle* of the *Detection* you come to the *Naration*, the proofe wherof you will not haue to depend vpon report of the fact but *vpon continuance of Essentiall Possessions and Dispossessions in these times.* A ridiculous thing, and to be hissed at. The reason why you eschew to deale against *matter of fact*, I haue sufficently declared in the beginning. Wel I wil follow you in your course, & come to your *Answere* to the *Doctrine*. Which treatise, to admit such an *hotchpotch* as you say, (*though* sober men *will iudge* it, set downe in such order as is conuenient) it is not for euery one to cooke his matters so artificially as your Discoursing gallimaufrey is: but the more skil it wants, the more credit for truth it ought to haue, seeing it tasteth simply as bare nature giues, without commendation of any slibbersauce. First for Essentiall possesion you reproue me or at least *Exorcistes*, for arguing from the word *Possession out of the Genenah translation*, whereas I no where, nor any man else, inferre essentiall inherencie from the word *Possession*, as I haue shewed in the Suruey of your *Dialog. Discourse*: yet is the same confuted by the *Originall*, by *Erasmus*, *Beza*, *Castalio*, and *Montanus*. But this was your voluntarie perhaps, before you came to your musicke, now let vs heare your set and meditated song. Wheras I argue a possesion thus: *The* *pag. 10. 11.* *pag. 12. 13.*

actions

pag. 13. 14. *actions or paſsions which the parties endured were ſupernaturall, and therefore proceeded from ſupernaturall cauſes.* You deny *the actions were ſupernaturall*, and that for three reaſons. Firſt, *Naturall cauſes haue had more wonderful effects*: which I think I haue ſufficiently anſwered in the beginning of your ſeuenth Dialogue. Now therefore in one word. Is nothing ſupernaturall in any creature, which is exceeded by anie other worke in nature? Then the ſoming, wallowing, the breaking of chaines aſunder, reported of Demoniakes in the Goſpel were not ſupernaturall, becauſe ſomething more wonderful may come from a naturall cauſe: as that mentioned by you of the little fiſh *Echneis*, which (being but halfe a foote long) if ſhee but once cleaue to the ſide of a ſhip, wil compel it perforce to ſtand ſtill, notwithſtanding the violence of the wind or oare. I am aſhamed to heare men thus abſurd. You might haue conſidered, had your wits beene your owne, that theſe actions or paſsions are not therefore ſupernaturall, and ſo called, becauſe they are more wonderfull then anie thing iſſuing from nature, which a naturall would ſcarce affirme: but partly becauſe they are (for the moſt part) aboue that, and more wonderfull then the nature of man can ſend forth; and partly in reſpect of the ſupernatural cauſe from which they did proceed, namely, the diuel. Secondly, ſay you, *One cauſe may bring forth ſundry effects, and one effect may proceed from ſundry cauſes.* Doubtleſſe happy might that man be, that could apply either this One cauſe, or theſe ſundry cauſes, to this cauſe we haue in hand. Is this your propoſition. If one cauſe may bring forth ſundry effects, and one effect proceede from ſundrie cauſes, then the Actions or Paſsions reported by me in the Demoniakes were not ſupernaturall? It is wonderfull what a man ſhal gaine by diſputing with you. For now haue I learned by your priuiledged propoſition, Not only theſe actions of our Demoniakes not to bee ſupernatural, but alſo neither any action of any Demoniake that either the Apoſtles, or Chriſt himſelfe deliuered. Thirdly, *The like effects iſſue from diuers diſeaſes.* I anſwere, If your skill in phyſicke be ſo great, tell vs. I beſeech you, from what diſeaſe ſo many & ſtrange effects might ariſe, as are witneſſed to haue bene in theſe parties: & what diſeaſe it was they had? Whether had they the *Lunacie*, or the *phrenſie*, or the *Epilepſie*, or the *Mother*, or it was ſome *Conuulſions*, or *Crampe* that they had? Name the diſeaſe. And if ſo manie effects doe not proceede from one diſeaſe, as it is very likely, declare how manie diſeaſes they had, and what they were. And whether they had all the diſeaſes you men-

Dialog. Diſ. 204.

mention: their *ſwelling* ariſing from the *Mother*: their foming from the *Epilepſie*, their extraordinarie ſtrength from *mania*, &c. and ſo had a compounded diſeaſe, percaſe of as manie ſeueral diſeaſes, as they had ſeueral effects. Tel vs alſo whether you haue ſeene one partie afflicted at the ſame time with *Melancholy, Lunacie, Phrenſy, Epilepſy, Mother, Conuulſion*, and the *Crampe*? Beſides, whether you haue known ſuch an one, diſeaſed with all theſe grieuous maladies, reſtored againe naturally to his health in one day? When you haue reſolued theſe doubts, we wil hold our ſelues ſatisfied for this argument. In the meane ſeaſon it remaines for all your anſwere, in as ful force as euer it did. And here we may obſerue, how all that they prattle both here and elſe where of *diſeaſes* (whereby they woulde perſwade, that the paſsions of the Demoniaks were not ſupernaturall, but might wel proceed from ſome natural diſeaſe) themſelues do ouerthrow, in affirming they are *Counterfeits*.

Againe, I ſhewing that *The toyes and fooleries, and blaſphemous ſpeeches vttered by the parties in their ſupernaturall paſsions, could not come immediately from God, and good Angels, and therefore no doubt from the diuell*: You anſwer firſt, *They were not ſupernaturall effects*: but this is your Cuckow ſong, oft auouched, neuer proued with anie reaſon that might ſo much as beſeeme *William Sommers*, one too renowmed in his time. Secondly, that *this (ſuppoſed impoſsibilitie for either God, or good Angels to effect any ſuch fantaſticall, vaine, and filthy effects, is too groſſe and abſurd.* Indeed you are the Maiſters of abſurdities, you may beſtow one where you wil, as this is a notable one, and not to be named, that one ſhould imagine *the moſt Holy Lord, and his holy Angels ſhould immediately by themſelues worke filthy effects*. The blaſphemies which ariſe from hence are not to bee remembred. There is neuer any filthineſſe committed, but either by the filthineſſe of our corrupt fleſh, or by the working of vncleane ſpirits: farre be it from vs, we ſhould once let it enter into our thoughts, that it did firſt iſſue, either from the fountaine, or frō the ſtreames of puritie. *The Lord his iudgements are tied to a ſeemely maner of effecting*, rightly vnderſtood, which you denie: that is, that all his iudgements ſhould bee effected by meanes beſt beſeeming their nature: as iudgements of committing ſinne are wrought by ſinfull meanes, the Diuel, and wicked men, and ſuch like, and not immediately by holy meanes: for this was to confound light and darkeneſſe, holineſſe and ſinne together. It is lamentable that anie carrying the name of Miniſters amongſt vs, ſhould be ſo impiouſly

pag. 15.

blind: and yet more lamentable, that they which will sit at the helme, wil suffer such impieties to be offered with their authoritie, to the world. Thirdly you answere, That *these vncleane effectes do no more argue an vncleane spirit, then those holy effects, as Confessing of Christ, and Expounding the Creed argue an holy spirit.* As if you had cleane forgotten, *The diuell can transforme himselfe into an Angell of light.* If you had remembred this, and your old crosse row, That there is no reasoning from contraries in common attributes, you would neuer haue bewrayed such intolerable babishnesse. Lastly, say you, *All this inferres no reall inherency, because the diuel can worke greater matters then these remaining without*: concerning which, wee wil see (God willing) in that which followeth.

2. Cor. 11. 14.

Pag. 15. 16.

Againe, wheras is vrged, the Diuels *entring in, & going out* of the partie possessed, you answere, *All these speeches, and whatsoeuer text can possibly be alleaged throughout the whole Scriptures, concerning either Angels, or Spirits, or Diuels are to be taken metaphorically*: and for this purpose you bring *the diuels compassing the earth: his walking through drie places: and his roaring like a Lyon.* As if because in these places there is some Metaphor, therefore all other must bee metaphorical too. Nay then let vs conclude, because these texts of Scripture be metaphorical, therefore all the Scripture is metaphoricall, and not onely those mentioning Angels and Diuels. And so we shal reuiue the wickednesse of the *Libertines*, of the *Family of loue*, and of the *Suenckefeldians*, acknowledging no literal sence of the Scripture, but a figuratiue meaning inspired into themselues, which only with them is the word of God. VVhen you disputed of the *Serpent in Euahs tentation*, you contended indeed *The Serpent was onely meant figuratiuely*, yet seemed after to reiect this opinion, and I liked well of it. But I crie you mercie: now I vnderstand you more fully. Wel then, the Angel *Gabriel* came to *Marie*, and brought tidings of her conceiuing the Sonne of God, was this done *Metaphorically*? Was there also no such thing literally done, as is reported the same Angel spake to *Zachary*, concerning *Iohn* the Baptist, whom hee should beget? Was that in figure too, that the Angels comforted our Sauiour before his passion? Belike when the Diuel cast the child some time into the fire, sometimes into the water, there was no such matter indeed, but onely by way of *Metaphor*. And when the Diuel cried, *VVhat haue I to do with thee O Iesus the Sonne of the most high God*, this voice was *Metaphoricall*. Howsoeuer these and many like Scriptures are canonized by you to bee *Metaphoricall*, yet your selues without

Iob. 1. 7.
Matt. 12. 43
Pet. 5. 8.

Luc. 1. 30.
Luc. 1. 12. &c.
Luc. 21. 43.
Mar. 9. 22.
Mar. 5. 7.

Metaphors, are most properly a couple of the absurdest Dunses that euer put pen to paper. You goe on, and labour to ouerthrow the literall entring of the Diuel, because in *Marke* it is said, *There was a man in the Synagogue in an vncleane spirit.* If the words (say you bee *taken literally, then the man was essentially inherent within the diuell.* I answere, Neither are these wordes taken literally, neither for this cause is the entring of Satan, mentioned elsewhere, to be vnderstood figuratiuely. The same thing may bee, and is vttered sometimes by figure, and sometimes by proper speech. One while our Sauiour Christ cals himselfe *The way*, and a *Doore*: In another place he saith, That they *which beleeue in him shall not perish*, expounding in plaine tearmes that which is spoken by similitude elsewhere. As for this Scripture, *To be in an vncleane spirit*, is not, as a thing cõtained in a thing containing, as water in a vessell, and such like, but to be in the power of an vncleane spirit, as our vulgar tongue expresseth fitly, when we say, Such an one is in a Feuer. M. *Beza*, in opening the meaning of this speech, vseth this selfe same example: and you your selues call it, *A very apt resemblance.* Seing therefore it fitteth so wel, let me demaund of you, when we say, *A man is in a Feuer*, whether you thinke the feuer is within, or without him? You had thought to haue played you with this feuer, but it shaketh you a little better then you were aware of. For it plainely declareth, that the natural meaning of the wordes, notwithstanding they bee figuratiue, doth note vnto vs an inbeing of the spirit. But you adde out of Saint *Luke*: *There was a man in the Synagogue, which had a spirit of an vncleane diuell. This translation*, say you, *is tolerable, if by the word Spirit we vnderstand not the simple essence, but onely the impulsion, motion, or inspiration of the Spirit.* I answer, we may. I graunt vnderstand by the word *Spirit*, an *impulsion, motion*, or *inspiration*, so wee doe not separate this Impulsion and motion from the reall presence of the Spirit. As when we talke of the vnderstanding of a man, wee know that vnderstanding is one thing, and the Man another, yet do not separate betweene the reall presence of these two, but ioyne them together. And to this effect *Caluin* writeth on this place: *This speech* (saith he) *is as much as if Luke had said, This man was moued by the inspiration of the diuell: for by God his permission Satan had possessed the powers of his soule, that he might enforce him at his pleasure, as wel to speake, as to other motions. And therfore when Deuils make speak, those very diuels, to whose rule they are permitted, both speake in them, & by them.* *Caluin* then graunts an *Inspiration*, but ioyned with the di-

pag. 17. 18. 19. *Mar.* 1. 23.

pag. 20. *Luc.* 4. 33.

uels

uels *preſence*: Theſe men make a diuorce betweene *Inſpiration* and *preſence*, as if theſe two could not abide within ſight one of another. *The inſpiration of the diuell is within, therefore his Eſſence is not*: which is as much to ſay, Becauſe a mans braines be in his head, therefore his wit is in his heeles. But to let this paſſe, this onely I ſay to you, which by *Spirit* here vnderſtand only the *motion, inſpiration, or inſtigation of the ſpirit*, and affirme, it is *groſſe to vnderſtand ſpirit Eſſentially*, that by this your goodly expoſition, this man muſt bee diſpoſſeſt of a *motion*, and not of a diuell.

pag. 21. Further I alleadging, The *Diuell cannot* poſſibly *ſo moue the members of a man as he doth cõmonly of demoniaks being only without him, you oppoſe the captiuating of the wicked, his tranſporting of Chriſt, his diſpoſing of the tongues of Shimei & Rabſhakeh, his filling of Ananias his heart*, and ſuch like. None of al which makes to any purpoſe. The members of demoniakes are in their ſupernaturall motions moued by the nerues, by the muſcles, by the Tendons, the vſuall mouers of the body: and yet without commaund either of *Will*, or *Imagination*, theſe faculties at that inſtant being diſabled to make choice of things according to their nature: yea ſomtimes there is a mouing in the body, without the ſeruice of the mouing inſtruments at all. But in the motions by you alleaged, there is no ſuch matter. For in Suggeſtions the diuell by deceiuing the phantaſie, and blinding the vnderſtanding, preuaileth againſt the will, and this ſeduced commanundeth all the inferiour parts, which he may performe outwardly. And as for tranſporting of bodies, here the whole body is caried violently, not by ordinarie ſtirring of thoſe inward mouers appointed to this dutie, but at the pleaſure of an outwarde cauſe, as when a man is caried in a ſhip, in a charret, on horſebacke, or after ſuch other manner. By which it is apparant, the motions which be vſually in Demoniakes, cannot be by outward ſuggeſtion, but only by inward operation, as diſpoſing of the ſeuerall members of the body without the Imagination and VVill, ſometimes by the inſtruments of motion, and ſometimes (which is more ſtrange) without. Moreouer, I ſhewing ſome argument for his inherencie, from *his earneſt deſire to enter into the bodies of men, and to dwell there*: which appeareth by this, that he is vnwilling to be caſt out: and being throwne out, findeth no reſt till he recouer his loſt habitation: yea he rather deſireth to enter into ſwine then to want a dwelling. You anſwere, *It is an idle conceit to dreame of ſuch a deſire: becauſe, The Lord neuer graunted him, nor hee euer deſired any ſuch thing,*

pag. 22. Matth. 8. 3 & 12. 43. Mar. 5. 12.

thing against Iob, & yet no doubt he craued as much against him, & had as much yelded, as euer against any. I reply: Whilest we are disputing of the qualitie of the Diuels vexation, you tel vs a tale of the quantitie. We are not now weighing whether *Iob* or Demoniaks are more grieuously afflicted, but whether they bee molested after the same maner. Albeit this is great ignorance in you, to think the torments of the body to proceed frō greater tyranny, then his malice that he powreth vpō the soule. Was not his power greater in *Iudas*, though no Demoniake, then in the man, whom he had possessed *a long time?* *Mar. 5. 3. &c*
But to returne to *Iob*: we neuer heard till this day that hee was a Demoniake: and by your rule, if *Iob* was not one (as his booke sheweth he was not) there was neuer anie: *because as much power was graunted against him, as against any*, and so all those Demoniakes mentioned in the Gospels by your reckening shall proue but tales. Let the same answere suffice you for *Ahabs prophets*, vntill wee may heare you are either of a better minde, or of more learning. That which you dispute of *Saul being possessed*, is an idle excursion of your owne, I no where maintaine it. Yet where you contend that *Pag. 29. 30.* *there were no possessions at all in Israel, till a little before the comming of Christ*, one might iustly demaund of you, which professe so greate insight in this matter, how the Iewes became so cunning to iudge of their possessed? And why *Eleazarus* in the dayes of *Vespasian* & *Iosephus*, boasted of *Salomons Exorcismes*? I doubt not but it was most false to attribute any such wickednes to that wise king: yet these men being but a little after our Sauiour Christ, might haue beene conuicted by the testimonie of many liuing, but especially by their owne histories, if they should haue fathered such practises vpon *Salomon*, which had beene euident did begin but yesterday. It seemeth then by opinion of those ancient Iewes, that Possessions & Dispossessions were before *Salomons* time, otherwise they would not haue made him an author of a thing that sprung vp after him. But you will proue by argument, that *none were possest till a little before the comming of Christ*. The first of your reasons are contained in these words: *Thus then it is euident that Saul was neuer possest, and so consequently, that (till a little before the comming of Christ) there were no possessions at all in Israel.* This argument I answere by the like. It is euident that *Saul* had not the * leprosie. *Ergo*, there were no Lepers in Israel, till a little before the comming of Christ. The other reason you render hereof is, because *this iudgement is not foretold & threatened the Iewes by some of the Prophets at least.* As though euerie

* *whiles hee was king.*

iudgement of God were ſpecified by ſome of the Prophets. But I
pag.31. will leaue you to ſport a while with *Saul*, as alſo with that of the *braſen Serpent*, which is a deuiſe of your owne in this matter, nothing pertaining to me.

Concerning ſupernaturall effects in *Sommers*, as that *hauing pins thruſt very deepe into his legs and other parts of his body without ſenſe, or*
pag.34. &c. *feeling thereof: Phyſialogus* anſwers, that *Sommers hath ſince depoſed, he felt the pinnes, but diſſembled the paines.* I anſwere, his depoſition no doubt is a thing much to be regarded, which hath ſold himſelfe to be at the Biſhops pleaſure, whereby there was nothing ſo apparantly falſe, which he would not dare to affirme, or deny, as hee perceiued his liking. But *Phyſialogus* tels vs further out of *Galen*, that *the common ſence being earneſtly emploied in ſome matter, the outward ſenſes perceiue not their owne obiect*: whereby *Sommers* in like manner might be ſenſleſſe then, as *Phyſialogus* is now. But to waken him a little, I would he would trie the pinnes himſelfe. No doubt his own meditations being farre more ſerious and waightie, then could bee in that paltrie boy, he ſhould receiue no paine at al: which if we this were once aſſured by his experience, then were wee thorough for point. For his *foming*, *Phyſialogus* anſwers, that *parties affected with the Epilepſie, foame*, and that *Scolds do foame*: vnto which adde theſe
pag.36. two Anſwerers: That *foame* out alſo their owne ſhame. Concerning their *violent motions and ſtirrings, extraordinary ſtrength, & knowledge*, you obiect nothing, but what *M. Harſnet* hath done before: vnto whom I haue anſwered. It had beene more beſeeming to haue replied to that, then thus to roll ouer the ſame ſtone againe. You call for *Knapping of yron chaines aſunder, and then you would beleeue*: as if the Lord muſt giue power to Satan to feede our vaine humours. But you remember who promiſed to beleeue too, if their curious deſires might haue beene ſatisfied, who euer ſcorned the preſent workes they ſaw, and ſtill deſired greater, but obtained not. If there had beene chaines broken, *M. Harſnet* woulde haue charged the Smith with confederacie, and would haue required they had beene
Diſcouery ſo *faſtened, as the Keeper of Newgate could haue faſtened them.* And
pag.29. yet ſuppoſe he had faſtened them, it would haue beene ſaid hee had combined with vs. If this could be cleared, then *Darrell* ſhould haue bewitched him, or *Sommers* himſelfe ſhoulde bee a witch. If this would not ſerue, yet ſome by argument would maintaine, that none can be poſſeſſed in theſe daies: nay, that there were neuer any poſſeſſed. So be the matter neuer ſo true and impoſsible to be counterfeited

feited, ſome thing would euer be excepted, as long as wee haue to deale with men Lords ouer their owne tongues, and haue no Lord on earth to controll them. Conſidering then I haue to meddle with men of this kind, who, ſo they bee ſaying ſomething, ſpare not to ſay any thing bee it neuer ſo falſe, vncredible, and abſurd, it ſhall be folly in me to ſpend words about them.

You affirme: *The Deponents themſelues haue ſince more aduiſedly reformed their oaths, and depoſed the contrary.* I anſwer: They haue done nothing leſſe. Nay, their reexaminations make more for the confirming, then weakening of that they formerly depoſed. And this I haue made euident in my former anſwere to the Chapter of *Reexaminations*: where *M Harſnet* obiecteth the very ſame you do here. VVhereunto you ſhould haue returned a reply, or elſe for ſhame neuer mentioned that, which is alreadie anſwered. But you may bee aſhamed (if you be not paſt all ſhame) to ſay, that they reexamined depoſed thus: namely, that *now by their better enlightened iudgemẽts, they plainly perceiue all thoſe the former ſuppoſed ſupernaturall actions or paſsions, to be but meere counterfeit toyes, and plaine coſoning practiſes.* O palpable ſlaunder! *W*hat wil you ſticke to affirme, who ſpare not to publiſh this for truth? I refer thee good Reader, to my *Detection*, the place before quoted, where thou ſhalt ſee this to be moſt vntrue. *W*hereas I ſay, *they would haue puniſhed the witneſſes, if theſe things had beene found counterfeit*: you anſwere, as if they were diſmiſſed vpon compaſsion, being ſilly poore perſons: and yet of about thirtie that haue teſtified the things vnpoſsible to be counterfeited, vpon their corporali oathes, ſeuen of them be preachers.

pag. 41.

Detect. lib. 3. cap. 8.

pag. 42.

After you come to the *ſignes of Poſſeſſion*, which you denie *to bee ſet downe as rules to diſcerne Eſſentiall Poſſeſſions by*. They be rules of ſuch poſſeſsions as were in the Scriptures: and wee haue ſhewed them to be Eſſentiall, whatſoeuer yet you either haue, or can prate to the contrarie. How fooliſh and beggarly the words be, you further multiply to this end, I haue manifeſted in your Diſcourſes, I need not repeate them. For the *number of ſignes* I ſtand not ſtrictly vpon them. *W*here they are all, I ſay there is a Poſſeſſion: I doe not ſay, where there be fewer, or diuers others, there is no Poſſeſſion. For this is free to the Lord to afflict in what meaſure it pleaſeth him. Neither do I *croſſe my ſelfe*, as you vntruly charge me, *making the Scripture ſignes the onely meanes to diſcerne of Poſſeſſions: and then in the 16. & 17. pag. euery way equal my experimented ſignes with any of them*. I onely in the pages mentioned name ſome fewe ſuper-

pag. 43. &c.

pag. 45.

natural

naturall effects, which in experience I haue obſerued in Demoniakes. But in what place I ſet them, and how I account of them, is euident in the 37. page, where ſpeaking of experimented ſignes, I vſe theſe words: *But the Scripture making no mention of theſe ſignes, they are to be regarded accordingly.* And ſo likewiſe in the 22. page. In *the application of the ſignes*, you impute vnto me diuers contrarie-

pag. 46. ties after your lying and ſlaunderous manner. As if I ſhould ſay: *Sometimes they haue ſupernaturall ſtrength and knowledge, yet ſometimes*

Doctr. pag. 16. 17. *againe, they onely ſeeme to haue. Sometime Satan hurtes, but hurtes not indeed, &c.* Touching the firſt of theſe, I hauing ſpoken of the ſupernaturall ſtrength and knowledge of the parties controuerted, in the concluſion thereof ſhew, that *I am not ſo to be vnderſtood, as though I meant that they had ſupernaturall ſtrength and knowledge: but therefore is this aſcribed vnto them by mee, becauſe they ſeeme to haue ſuch knowledge and ſtrength.* And thus oft in ſcripture is that attributed to Demoniakes, which was indeed performed by the diuell, and done onely by them in a ſeeming ſhew. So the Demoniake, *Mark 5.* is ſaid to *breake chaines and fetters aſunder*, whereas not he, but the diuell brake them. And this is one of your worthy contradictions. Concerning the latter, I ſay thus, that *However they are ſo miſerably vexed by Satan, as the beholders would iudge them in moſt extreme and intollerable paines, yet they feele no paines at all. Yet I doubt not but that Satan can ſo order the matter, as that the Poſſeſſed ſhall haue paine, when he ſhall ſee it ſerue for his purpoſe, &c.* By which I ſhewe there is

pag. 48. not one vniforme order to be expected in theſe caſes: which varietie of affliction, theſe men would draw to inconſtancie of opinion. You condemne me alſo for *thinking, The Scripture ſignes are not recorded onely as matter of fact, but partly to helpe vs in diſcerning of poſſeſſions.* I ground my reaſon on the queſtion of our Sauiour: *How*

Mar. 9. 21. *long time is it he hath beene thus?* You anſwere, *Chriſt reſpecteth in this queſtion onely the firſt time of that accident.* And I reply, you reſpect in this anſwer how to trifle off any thing obiected againſt you, with fooliſh words without any ſubſtance at all. Doth not our Sauiour ioyne together with the time, the maner and forme of his handling? Doth he not enquire as well of the one, as of the other? We muſt haue a queſtion of time without any ſubiect matter, or reference to any thing. Miraculous Anſwerers, which can meaſure time without any ſtandard laid vnto it! You charge me with *foiſting in words into the text* for aduantage: but it is your owne mouthes which runne

pag. 49. ouer with the word *Eſſentially*, and not any addition of mine. I con-

tent

tent my selfe with the phrase of the holy Ghost, reiecting these tearmes as needlesse and superfluous. Though whersoeuer the diuel is, this speech properly vnderstood (as it is vsually in the matter of Possession) there must also his spiritual essence be. That which you thinke is more then the text, is onely added to paraphrase it: and though these words *In him*, be not in this Scripture, yet are they else where vsed in like case: you are very hungry, which would leap at so small a morsell. *Act.* 19, 16.

Whether there be a medicine or no for curing Essentiall possession, you say, *we shall see after in handling that point*, and I am content to refer it thither. As for *speedie deliuerance of the afflicted*, I acknowledge it is no argument of possession: and I thanke you for reproouing it, though of my selfe I would be ready to retract anie thing dissonant from the truth. It is not my desire, any my stubble should bee layd vpon the foundation, but I am cõtent the fire of Gods word should consume it. *pag.* 50. 51. 52.

I alleaging those words of the law, *That the Lord will bring vpon transgressors euery sickenesse, and euery plague which is not written in the booke of the Law, vntill they be destroyed*: And also that of Saint *Iohn*: *He that shall adde vnto these things, God shall adde vnto him the plagues that are written in this booke*, to proue that men may now be possessed: you answere, *I abuse the Scripture, making Possession sometimes written, sometimes vnwritten*. But you abuse your selues, and your Reader to iangle about that, which euerie childe might teach you. For who knowes not that some thinges might bee vnwritten in the Law, that be very frequent in the Gospel, as indeed Possession is? But to answer my argument out of these places, you denie *Essentiall possession to be decreed in God his eternall counsell for a iudgement*. That Possession is *essentiall*, we haue sufficiently proued in suruey of your *Discourses*. That it is *decreed for a iudgement*, may appeare to any not wilfully blind, by those manifolde examples of men possessed in the Scriptures: Except those things hapned beside the decree of God, or else those possessions were rewards and benefits, not iudgements and afflictions. It may be your impudent vaine will not sticke to admit either, though none can avouch the first but Atheists, nor the second but only men that are mad. I haue shewed in your *Discourse*, how the Lords iudgements are perpetuall, though not inflicted euerie moment, but after such intermission as pleaseth him. Is it not then excellent stuffe you bring, *That the iudgements of this life* (for we speake only of them) *cannot perpetually* *Deut.* 28. 61 *pag.* 53. *Reuel.* 22. 18 *pag.* 53. *pag.* 54.

bee inflicted, but ſalvation muſt needs be barred from all *in Chriſt?* In like maner, becauſe I ſay, *Poſſeſſion is but a conditionall and temporall iudgement*, you therefore interre, *It is not perpetuall.* Where you play with the word, meaning by *perpetuall*, a continued connexion, ſuch as nothing may be put betweene, when as that is vſually ſaid to bee perpetuall, which is common to all ages, though it appeare but now and then. You charge me with diſputing from *May be*, to *a being in deed.* May not I wel diſpute, *It may be*, where you would euerie where maintaine *It cannot bee?* How can a being indeede bee concluded, before it be manifeſt the ſame thing *May be?* If the heauens therefore fall, we ſhall not onely catch Larks, as you ſay, but by catching alſo of you two, we ſhall catch ſomething that wants braines.

pag. 55.

I affirming, *There is as great cauſe of this iudgmēt now, as at any time heretofore*: you anſwere, It *is vtterly vntrue: The manifeſtation of Chriſts Deitie, and the confirmation of his glorious Goſpel being the maine cauſes of poſſeſsiō in Chriſts time.* My meaning is as appeareth by my words, there is as great cauſe in reſpect of ſin, as much abounding now as euer. For I do not compare this cauſe of puniſhment, with the manifeſtation of Chriſt his Deitie. And therfore beſides the ceaſing of the two *maine cauſes*, you ſhould alſo haue ſhewed that ſin was ceaſed, or elſe ſinne to be no cauſe: which you purpoſe to doe in the pages following. But in the meane ſeaſon, how doe you flouriſh it, as if I ſhould proudly *limit the Lord his times and ſeaſons for inflicting his iudgements?* I limit no times, but leaue it free to the Lord: yet knowing the reward of ſinne, and the ample kingdom it now hath, according to the maner of all the Prophets, I can do no leſſe then expect his fearefull iudgements of what kind ſo euer. But you will proue *Poſſeſsion is no puniſhment for ſinne*, and that out of the *Depth of Diuinity*. Your reaſon is, *Afflictions of this life, laid vpon the Elect, be not properly puniſhments.* It is true: but what do you lay to this? *poſſeſsion of Diuels is an affliction of this life.* We graunt this too: yet ſo, that not onely Poſſeſsion is an affliction of this life, but that there be infinite other miſeries and calamities beſides. What then? Shall we now conclude, That no miſerie or calamitie whatſoeuer, as weil as this of Poſſeſsion, is any puniſhment for ſinne? O deepe Diuinitie, and ſuch as hath not beene raiſed from the bottomleſſe pit till now! I denie not but the Lord may impoſe it vpon a man for trial, and for other ends, as he knowes beſt, but may he not alſo therfore inflict it as a chaſtiſement for ſinne, or caſtigatorie puniſhment? But your aſſumption containeth more in it, vz. that *Poſſeſsion is an affli-*

pag. 56.

pag. 57. 58.

ction

ction of this life laid vpon the elect. This also I confesse is true: but it will not aduantage you, except ye adde, that it is *laid onely vpon the elect*, and then shall we haue Possession a note of our election, and so a blessed thing to be possest with diuels, which is such diuinitie, as neuer Diuine, deepe or shallow, once dreamed of. It is a shame to rehearse your fooleries. Then you will vrge it more strongly, for that our *Sauiour curing the possessed hath giuen them no watchword of sinning no more.* This *watchword* was giuen but in one cure, as I remember. Was all other diseases therefore no chastisements for sin? Whether our Sauior speake, or whether be silent, you are men that can take occasion for your absurdities vpon either. I will not waste paper with rehearsing more of this stuffe. Consider with your selues that lesser afflictions be punishments for sinne, as we speake vulgarly, if your profunditie will giue vs leaue: That all death is the stipend of sinne, and that Possession is a kind of death. Besides, Offenders are deliuered to Satan by the Church, not for reward, but for Chastisement. And if to bee in the power of Satan howsoeuer, bee a chastisement, what is it to be in his possession? Is not he the Executioner appointed ouer the wicked? Hath not hee the power of death? How can any one be in his hands, and bee not in death? Or how in death, and not in punishment? Our Sauiour teacheth that Repossession hapneth vpon negligence and securitie, whereby it may bee apparant, that the first possession is not for a mans vertues. It it needlesse to vse many proofes in a plaine case, if I had not to deale with men to whom Sunshine is darkenesse.

Iob. 5. 14.

Leuit. 26. 16 18.
Deut. 28. 27
Rom. 6. 23
Ephes. 2, 1.
1. Cor. 5. 5.
Heb. 2. 14
1. 2. 44

The *testimonies of the Doctors*, which I alleage *in the Margine*, you blame, for that *they be not fully set downe.* You haue examined them in your *Discourses*, and confesse they speake as I report them. I omitted in this place to put downe their wordes, being after to vse them in proofe of Dispossession by prayer and fasting since miracles ceased. Which position you see includes the former, and to what purpose should I clogge the Reader with vnnecessarie repetition? Nay what should I be burdensome to you? For in that place where they do speake, they speake so plainely, as you could with their tongues were out, as we shal see in the next dialogue. If you would discredite *Vierus*, reporting *seuentie damsels in Rome possessed with sprites in one night*, it had beene meet you should haue done it with some probabilitie: it is not vnough, for that it was at *Rome.* Will you credit nothing done in that king dome? No maruell, you will not credit things done at home, though neuer so substantially certaine,

pag. 59.

Dialog. Disc. pag. 171.

taine. It is likely, if it had bene but a practise of *Romane Exorcists*, they would haue dispatched it in lesse then *two yeares*. None of the was recouered within this time. To haue so many possessed, and for so long time, and not one of them to be dispossessed, made little for the credit of the Exorcists, and of the Popish Church, if Dispossession be a marke of the true Church, as the Papists teach. And so of *Anno 1566* the *thirtie children possessed at Amsterdam*, the same yeare they broke downe their images, and reformed the Religion, as if the Diuell the more raged, considering his short time there, as he vsually doth at his farewell. *Thyreus* his report may be allowed at least, in thinges *pag. 60.* that are witnessed by others. Neither did *D. Fulke not inveigh against Possession, because it had no maintainers in his time*, but because it was gainsaid by none. *M. Foxe, M. Lane, M. Robinson*, with sundry other Diuines liuing in *D. Fulke* his time, were of opinion there were possessions, as appeared by their practise, and some of their writings. But what needed any should with earnestnes defend that, which no man of any reckening oppugned? This controuersie is new sprung vp, first hatched, and brought into light by enuie, and still nourished by flatterie and Ambition, and expectation to get something from his good Lordship. For your argument *from Miracles*, I hope I haue quashed it in your tenth Dialogue. Is it not wonderfull that you acknowledging *Possession to be a supernaturall disease, and a thing* *pag. 62.* *hidden in the secret counsel of God, to execute and effect when and where he will, and therefore may neuer by any man liuing be auouched for certaine*, that you dare so presumptuously conclude, that *now there can be no possession*? If it be so *secret* as you say, it is no lesse daunger for you to denie it, then for me to affirme it. But you are like the prudent topper of trees, that strikes in sunder the verie bough hee stands on.

For *prayer and fasting how it is a meanes to expell Satan*, wee shall *pag. 62. 63.* see more, God willing, in the next Dialogue, if any thing bee needfull to be added to that already spoken. *Whereas* I put a difference between the curing of possessiõs now, & those done by the Apostles for that now it is done by an *intreating word*, then *by a bare cõmanding word*. you answere, as beseemeth your absurd fashion, that *Miraculous curing of possessions in Christs time was at no hand effected by a bare commaunding word, but by a supernaturall power concurring therewith*. O deepe Clerks, and men that haue diued to the verie bottome of Diuinitie! When we make comparison of meanes vsed by men, what haue we to doe with *supernaturall power*? Doth either

eyther the *intreating word* or *Commanding word* exclude that? Would any men in their wits denie the work of the instrument, because it is moued by the principall cause? Meate doth not nourish, because the Lord giueth strength, & the staffe to bread: Faith is not by hearing, because it is the gift of God. Such are the demonstrations wherewith these *Discoursers* think they haue put all the world to silence: which happily they haue done, except it be for laughing. I do no where affirme that Possession is *a naturall disease*, and therfore do not goe about by *Matth.* 4.24. and *Luke* 8.21. to proue it, because in those places it is iointly *recorded with naturall diseases*, wherewith you charge me, and by diuerse arguments verie soberly confute me: but saying that *Possession with Diuels is in the Gospel oft brought in among other plagues of God*, for proofe thereof, I doe produce the aforesaid Scriptures. Indeed I say, that *Possession is a disease*, but adde, *to wit, supernaturall*: and a little after call it an *vnnaturall disease*: Whereby I make it plaine, what manner of disease I account it to be. If you would nowe haue confuted me, you should haue bent your force against these things I say, and not against that I no where do affirme. But this is with you an vsuall thing. You adde, that I *deeming possession to be but a meere naturall maladie, doe directly crosse my former speeches where I make it a supernaturall maladie*. And this forsooth is one of your Contradictions. But you must first proue better then you haue done yet, that I doe not onely *deeme*, but say, that *Possession is a naturall maladie*, before it be so indeed that *I crosse mine owne speech*. If I were giuen as much to crosse my body, as you say I am to *crosse my selfe in my speech*, I were a very fit man to make a Papist, who loue of life to *crosse* themselues. To make vp your summe, you foist vs in a counterfeit, That *all supernaturall works are miracles*, as if faith, hope, and charitie, peace of conscience, and such like were all miracles: which if it be true, we must needs stil haue miracles, or els haue no Church. The Papists would be glad to heare of these tidings, but no body else, except such as would reioyce at your folly. For your *second, third, fourth*, and *fift Dialogues, wherein*, you thinke, *you haue ouerthrowne Essentiall possession*, by that time you haue weighed in a iust ballance, what hath beene answered thereunto, you shall perceiue to haue preuailed as much, as if you had laboured to ouerthrow your Peake hils. You say, *You haue shewed Possession is not inflicted for sinne*, but I say, you must shew it better, before any man of wisdome can beleeue you. I haue branded your absurditie in your *Discourses*, for that you con-

pag. 64. Matt. 8. 16. 17. Luc. 8. 21.

pag. 65.

pag. 66. 67.

Iob. 12. 31. clude a *finall end of possession from the casting forth of the prince of this world.* Here you increase it a thousand folde in making your owne singular, foolish, and impious wresting of this Scripture, to contain a matter of no lesse certaintie, then is the expresse word of God, for an *vtter end of any the like flood to that, which was in Noahs time.* I Genes. 9. 14. 15. do not tie the Lord *to the punishment of Gomorrah, or of the children deriding the prophet, or of Gehazi,* and such others: but where the like sinnes raigne, there may be the like punishment, which you will not grant in actuall Possession, hauing put a necessarie end vnto it. But you wil not be pressed with *May be.* Much a do you keep with this pag. 68. Sophisme, *a posse ad esse.* Whersoeuer you meet with *may* or *can* in the conclusion, then ettioones you tell vs of this fallacie. As in your *Discourses* your skil in Rhetorike, & in discerning of *Tropes* did faile you: so here it doth in Logicke, & in discerning *Elenchs.* To auouch *Possession of deuels to bee inflicted also for sinne is Cuckolike melodie* in your eares, but you haue sung vs a lacke Dawes song in limitting pag. 67. it with * *two onely ends,* that is, *of confirmation of Christs Deity, and of the Gospell,* as I haue abundantly proued.

Whereas I affirme the iudgement of our senses for the truth of *Sommers vexation by Satan,* you reply, *Our senses could not comprehend such supernaturall matters:* besides, *they might be deluded, and deuels can do things in shew.* pag. 69. For *comprehension,* seeing you depriue vs of all iudgement of sense, blame vs not if we be something dull in conceiuing this, How that seeing, we do not see: feeling, we do not feele: smelling, we do not smell: and hearing, wee doe not heare: and that we require you would make it plaine vnto vs. Which when you haue once done, and beaten into our heads, I will neuer trust mine eyes againe, though I should see *M. Deacon* in forme of an Angel of light. But if our *senses were deluded,* & things *done in shew,* that were not in deed, surely it was Satan that deluded vs, and no counterfeiting in *Sommers,* as you would faine haue it. This is the summe of your first dialogue against me, to which *Lycanthropus* subscribeth as *able to suffice any reasonable man:* but this, is but a small thing, saith *Pneumatomachus,* and therfore he stretcheth the matter to an higher pitch, That *neither any vnreasonable man* (which is much more) *shall be euer able to answer it.* So that now we are much beholding to M. *Deacon,* and M. *Walker,* that haue put all *fooles* and mad men to a perpetuall *non plus,* whose tongues would otherwise continually bee tampring.

Concerning the straunge and present affliction of the boy of *Northwitch,*

Northwitch, Is ill say nothing: I neuer sawe him: howsoeuer you descant on the matter after your lying & paltry maner. Yet *I* think it not amisse to offer to thy view (good Reader) the iudgement of the Bishop of *Chester* in his direction to his parents, and of three other Commissioners for causes Ecclesiasticall, according with him therein. *pag.* 71.

First we thinke it fit, and doe require the parents of the said childe, that they suffer not any to repaire to their house to visite him. saiuing such as are in authority, and other persons of speciall regard and knowne discretion, and to haue speciall care that the number alwayes be very smal. Further hauing seene the bodily affliction of the said child, and obserued in sundry fits very strange effects and operations, either proceeding of naturall vnknowne causes, or of some diabolical practise: we thinke it conuenient and fit for the ease and deliuerance of the said childe from his grieuous afflictions, that prayer be made for him publikely by the minister of the parish, or any other preacher repairing thither, before the congregation so oft as the same assembleth. And that certaine preachers, namely, M. Garrad, M. Massey, M. Coller, M. Haruey, M. Eaton, M. Pierson *and* M. Brownhill *these onely and none other to repaire vnto the saide child by turnes, as their leisures will serue, and to vse their discretions by priuate prayer and fasting, for the ease and comfort of the afflicted: with all requiring them to abstaine from all solemne meetings, because the calamitie is particular, and the authoritie of the allowing and prescribing such meetings resteth neither in them nor in vs, but in our Superiours, whose pleasure it is fit we should expect. Moreouer, because it is by some held that the child is really possessed of an vncleane spirit, for that there appeareth to vs no certaintie, nor yet any great probability thereof, wee thinke it also conuenient, and require the preachers aforesaid to forbeare all formes of Exorcisme, which alwayes imply and presuppose a reall and actuall possession.*

Rich. Cestrensis.
David Yale. Chancel.
Griff. Vaughan.
Hugh Burghes.

Hereunto I will adde a fewe lines, which *M. Haruey* aforesaid, a man of great learning and godlines, writ in his life time to a friend of his.

Grace & mercie from our only Sauior. There is such a boy as your report signifieth,

ſignifieth, whoſe eſtate from the beginning of February till this preſent, hath beene ſo ſtrange and extraordinarie, in regard of his paſſions, behauiour, and ſpeeches, as I for my part neuer heard, nor read of the like. Few that haue ſeene the variety of his fits, but they thinke the diuell hath the diſpoſing of his body. My ſelfe haue diuers times ſeene him, and ſuch things in him as are impoſſible to proceed from any humane creature. The matter hath affected our whole countrey. The Diuines with vs generally hold, that the child is really poſſeſſed. And ſo much for him.

We ſee what the Biſhop and Preachers of Cheſſe-ſhire their iudgement is touching this child. What ſay nowe the *Diſcourſers* concerning him? They after they haue for three leaues together ſcoffed at his *grieuous affliction* (for ſo the Biſhop before tearmeth it) in moſt prophane, childiſh, and ſcurrulous maner, doe in the end affirme, that he counterfeiteth, and that this would ſoone apeare, *if he were well coniured a while with a three corded whip.* Is this the fruit of your viſiting the child? you had better haue kept you at home. *Was* this all the comfort the diſtreſſed boy and parents receiued from you? Miſerable comforters then are you. *Is* this the mercy, and all the bowels of compaſsion that is in you, towards him that is in miſerie? O mercileſſe men, and voyd of all pitie! It appeareth you haue not learned to *weepe, with them that weepe.* Well, I can tell you of a couple of ſuch merrie or mercileſſe companions as your ſelfes, that comming of late to one M. *Iames Charles* of Wolroych in Kent, to ſee his daughter *Clement Charles*, who is reputed to be poſſeſt with the diuell, & not without cauſe, they ſcarce went ſo merrily home, as they were at M. *Charles*, and yet but a ſmall thing befell them by the way. Returning home, they went by one M. *Hooke* his houſe of *Darlton*, maiſter not long before to this maid, at whoſe houſe ſhe began to bee afflicted. Now as they were on horſebacke before M. *Hooke* his doore, and ſporting themſelues with him about the counterfeiting of this new vpſtart counterfeit, behold, one of their horſes ſtaled blood, and as they were talking thereof, loe, the other did the like: whereat they were ſomewhat appaulled. How it fared with their horſes after I know not, but the day following they caried themſelues at M. *Charles* more ſoberly, whether they went on other horſes. But hereof ynough: I will nowe proceede to your ſecond Dialogue.

pag. 76.

Rom. 12. 15.

A REPLIE TO THE SECOND DIALOGVE,

THe ſecond part of my *Doctrine* treateth, That *thoſe eight before mentioned were verily diſpoſſeſſed, & that by faſting and prayer, the meanes appointed by God.* For confirmation wherof, I knew no better rule then the example of men diſpoſſeſſed in holy Scripture, which is the onely true and vnfallible touchſtone to examine both this, and all other actions by. Theſe *Anſwerers* ſcorne theſe *notes*, calling them *falſly pretended ſignes of diſpoſſeſſion from ſacred Scripture*, and therefore pretermitting them, require my argumentes, as if the Signes from Scripture were no arguments at all. It ſeemeth you haue found a veine of better mettal then the Scriptures, frō whence your whole booke is ſo full ſtuffed with your owne ſhining droſſe, and is ſo vtterly deſtitute of this purified gold. Yet you cannot beat me from them, but I vrge them thus: *There were in our Demoniakes the ſelfe ſame ſignes or notes of diſpoſſeſſion, precedent and ſubſequent, which wee reade of in the Scripture Demoniakes, and therefore the ſame diſpoſſeſſion:* you anſwere, *There were not the ſame ſignes in our demoniakes: and firſt*, becauſe *they were meere coſonages, as is confeſſed freely by the parties themſelues vpon their owne oathes.* I reply, the parties we ſpeake of, bee eight in number, whereof onely *Sommers* hath made this curſed confeſſion: which was not free and voluntarie, as you vntruly affirme, but extorted by Satan, and his inſtruments, as in my *Detection* I haue made manifeſt. But what ſay you to the ſeuen in *Lancaſhire*? It may be *Sommers* hath ſworne for thē all: for they as yet, were neuer examined: yet becauſe we doubt of *Somers* general oath, *I* pray you proue vnto vs, who taught the children to counterfeit? when, and where, and by what meanes they were taught? what end might induce them to imbrace ſuch teaching? whether the parents were priuy to it? and what they propounded in practiſing ſuch wickedneſſe? Yea, put *Sommers* too into the roll, & ſhew vs what man is able by practiſe to do the things that either *Sommers* or they did? And one woulde thinke a man of meane agility might quickly performe that, which coſoning yong boyes and girles could. Shew vs, I beſeech you, theſe and ſuch like things, or otherwiſe if you cannot ſhew thē, & yet tel vs of *coſonage*, you ſhew vs nothing but your long eares, & braſen faces. Secondly,

pag. 82.

Detect. pag. 127.

pag. 83. say you, *The signes in the Scripture Demoniakes were sensibly perceiued by the beholders: but these in your pretended Demoniakes were not so, by your own confession.* Belike all we that were spectators of our Demoniakes, being (at sundrie times) a great multitude, were all stricken with blindnesse, with deafnesse, and with a benummednes, and yet we all thought we vsed our senses, and I am sure, wee were no sooner out of the place, but we were able, the Lord bee thanked, to see, heare, and feele. But you confirme this by *mine own confession,* which saith, that *the spirit could not possibly be felt or seene.* I said so, & say so againe, that Spirits cannot be felt or seene in their owne bare essence, but as they make themselues known vnto vs by their effects. Iangling Sophisters will dispute, That the nose of a mans face cannot be seene, because that which we see is but colour or forme, and the nose it selfe is neither of both. Your eares ring it may bee with their noise, which hath made you borrow an argument from them. Thirdly, you say, *The Signes we report are false*: which I would graunt you, if your selues had learned to speake truth. We must remember there are aboue two hundred witnesses hereof liuing at this day, of which some haue deposed the same wee report of *Sommers.* Fourthly, say you, *Scripture Signes can argue no Dispossession now, because like effects may arise frō naturall causes, and coporall diseases.* By this your good helpe Atheists might ouerthrow all Possessions and Dispossessions in the scripture. But howsoeuer you may be friendly to such vile wretches, yet haue they no foothold from hence. For neither those effects in those ancient Demoniakes, nor in these of our time iointly & wholy considered can proceed from naturall disease. Naturall causes can bring forth no supernaturall effects, as we haue demōstrated these to be in spight of your seuenth Dialogue, and what other treaty soeuer you oppose against it. Lastly, say you, *A dispossession may bee without such apparant signes, and therefore your signes precedent and subsequent do not necessarily conclude a dispossession.* What? Because it is sometimes without these signes, therefore where these signes are, shall it not be? It is sometime day light without the cleare sunshine, therefore when the Sunne shines cleare shall it not be day? Sometimes the murderer slayes a man and is not taken with the manner, therefore if he be taken with the manner, shall he not necessarily bee concluded a murtherer? These are good rules to make a man impudent in sinne: for by them the bold offender shall speede better, then hee that doth it minchingly. You haue spoken then pretily against these signes, but without any

Doct. pag. 37

signe

ſigne of truth or wit.

From Scripture ſignes I deſcend to ſome experimented by my ſelfe in dealing with Demoniakes, which haue reported certaine viſible ſhapes, in which the diuels ſeemed to depart from them. But here I am taken vp for halting, in that I call it *My experience, which was proued in the perſons of other.* I confeſſe I ſpake rudely, as all other men do, which call a phyſition a man of good experience, though he hath not proued all the diſeaſes, he hath dealt with, in his owne body. As for *viſible ſhapes, you vtterly deny, that Spirits could procure the*: yet they did before *Pharaoh*, and infinite others ſince, as wee haue ſhewed by better arguments in my ſuruey of your fourth and fift Dialogues, then you euer haue, or can for the contrarie. Some alſo I ſhew did *vomit*, or ſtraine to vomit when the diuel departed. With this you make good ſport, perhaps ticled with remembrance, that you haue returned to your owne vomit. pag. 84. pag. 85.

Further, I concluding a diſpoſſeſſion, from the preſent effect of our prayers (wherof the like is not in naturall diſeaſes.) You charge me with *proper tearmes, as with certaine charming words to conjure the Lord with*, for ſo it pleaſeth your prophane mouthes to ſpeake. And yet I do not vſe the word *proper*. Onely I ſay, *And God heard our prayer vttered in ſuch tearmes*, that is, made to that effect, as before I haue ſhewed in briefe. I neuer dreamed that ſuch Argooſes would come after mee with ſo manie eyes, to finde an hole in my coate for theſe words more thē in all other mens. But to let words paſſe, you would diſproue the effect of our prayers, for that we could not make the parties *the Temples of the holy Ghoſt*, as we had prayed. Wee challenge no ſuch power, but we might well hope of the mercy of the Lord to ſanctifie them, which did plainly behold his great goodneſſe in deliuering them from Satans great rage. Howſoeuer mee thinks you ſhould not be offended with vs for putting vp this requeſt to God. And what if the Lord doth not alwayes yeelde preſent ſucceſſe to the prayers of his ſeruants? Could we not therfore be aſſured he had now heard vs, when we ſaw the thing performed before our eyes? It is true the Diuel ſometime ſeemeth to depart, when he doth not: but when it is at the requeſts of Gods people: when it is after ſuch grieuous vexation as was in the Demoniakes in the Goſpell, when it is with the health of the parties, and preſent freedome from all former vexations dy Satan, wee need not doubt of it in any ſort. For the viſible departure of Satan, I anſwered you euen very now. pag. 86.

Beſides,

pag. 87. 88. 89. Besides, I alleage for Dispossession, *Satans desire of repossession, which is neuer but after he is throwne out.* You returne a double answere, first, *that these wordes, I will returne to the house from whence I came, &c. be metaphoricall.* Wee remember indeede your monstrous absurditie in making *all things whatsoeuer spoken of Angels, and diuels in the scripture, to be Meaphoricall.* But as I haue shewed you, manie are not Metaphoricall, so neither is this repecting the sentence of it. The words be part of a similitude, as is plaine by the reddition, *So shall it be to this wicked generation.* The whole standeth thus. As when an vncleane spirit goeth forth of a man, passeth through drie places seeking rest, and findeth none: then saith, I will returne to my house, &c. entring againe in, the last estate of that man is worse thē the first. so shal it be to this wicked generatiō. Now to find what part of this sentence is Metaphoricall, we are to know that a similitude is twofold. One which is contracted & shut vp in one word, properly called a Metaphor: the other displaid & spread open, consisting of all the parts at large, and is tearmed by the name of the generall, a Similitude. For the figuratiue part in either, the reason is one in both. Therfore as in a contracted similitude, the Metaphor lyeth in the word that is borrowed, and not in that from whence it is borrowed, so in the larger similitude, the metaphoricall part of it resteth in the Reddition, not in the Proposition. For example, Honour nourisheth Artes: the word Nourisheth being borrowed frō meats nourishing the bodie, is a Metaphor as it is applyed to Honour, and Artes, but attributed to his proper termes, it is no Metaphor, as to say thus, Meat nourisheth the body. In like manner (to make a full Similitude of it, in this sort) As meat nourisheth the body, so Honour nourisheth Artes, the Metaphoricall part of the whole, lyeth in the latter member, not in the first. So likewise when our Sauiour saith, As a man deliuered from the possession of Satan, and receiuing him in againe, is in worse case after, then before: So the nation of the Iewes, once deliuered from the kingdome of Satan, so long as the church of God was amongst them, and comming into his subiection againe by refusing Christ, should bee in more miserable condition then in any former time: the Metaphoricall sentence of this Similitude, is in the last branch of it, not in the first. Not becawse there be no Metaphoricall words in the first, as Drie places, house emptie, swept, garnished. &c. but for that wee now speake of Metaphoricall sentences, not of words. I frame my argument from the Proposition of the Similitude, the sentence where-

Matt. 12. 43

Matt. 12. 45

of

of is literall and historicall, not from the Reddition, whose sense is allegoricall. Now then if a man should reason thus: The Reddition of the Similitude is Metaphoricall, therefore the whole is metaphocall, it is all one as if one should say, The blacke Moore hath white teeth, therefore he is all white. Which kinde of argument euerie chimney-sweeper would deride: and yet thus you reason from this place, and make it one of your chiefest props to vpholde your absurd conclusions with. But vnto this place I added another, where our Sauiour saith to the vncleane spirit, *Come out of him, and enter no more into him.* Was our Sauiours prohibition here in vaine? was this caution altogether needlesse and superfluous? How chaunce you past ouer this place, without answering one word vnto it? It was too plaine: and you two could not agree where the Metaphor should lie, & therefore thought better to slip it ouer, then by handling it, and bewraying your owne absurdities, to marre all. The reentrie therfore of Satan is plaine by the Scriptures: so that we need not the testimonie of any experience: yet I haue adioyned in the *Doctrine* the report of the children dispossessed, and the euidence of many godly then present, which perceiued by their agonie, and the words of their resistance, what Satan attempted. You trifle ouer this with greater childishnesse then appeared in the childrē, though but nine or tenne yeares old, and therefore I disdaine to answere it. Againe for proofe of dispossession, I alleage the *continuance of the parties health since*: you answere: *Their former fittes were but counterfeit, as themselues haue confessed.* A stale proofe of their counterfeiting, and answered before. The seuen in Lancashire neuer confessed any counterfeiting. Mar. 9. 25. pag. 90.

Thus hauing confirmed Dispossession, I remoue that vsuall obiection, shewing it is now no miracle, for that it is not done by absolute power of Christ in bodily presence, as he sometimes did it when he was here conuersant on earth, nor by any committed extraordinary power to men, but by fasting and prayer as the means. you answere first: *as if I affirmed Christs absolute power to be ceased*: which I affirme not, but account such affirmation blasphemie. He is not now present in bodie on earth, but worketh by his absolute authoritie still. Secondly, *If Christs absolute authority be the only efficient, then the worke is as miraculous, as euer.* Which is a flat vntruth, as I haue proued at large in your tenth Dialogue. For works done by men as instruments are distinguished by the maner of working, and not by the principall cause. you say *my Similitude from the* pag. 91. 92. 93.

Queene, and Lord Chauncelour is too absurd: for first, it is a case which neuer shall be, and so cannot illustrate. I had thought that *ficta similitudo* might haue had some force. But surely as you are full of newe Diuinitie, so I thinke you haue swallowed *Margaritam Philosophiæ*, you breake out on euerie occasion with such wonderfull new axiomes of Logicke. I intended that Similitude to the manner onely of Christs working, and you would extend it to the *like glory of his works now*, cleane beyond my purpose, and any good probabilitie. For are not Christs workes more glorious, when together with him selfe his seruants worke extraordinarily, as they did in the time of miracles, then now, when his seruants working is only ordinarie. But you will make the same similitude ouerthrow all miracles now, which I will yeeld for any, but for your selues: for you haue a priuiledge to do miracles, as is apparant in your tenth Dialogue.

pag. 94. Hitherto for *Dispossession*, now for the *meanes*: which I affirme with many godly and learned of auncient and our owne times,

Matt. 17. 21 to be *fasting and prayer*, out of the words of our Sauiour, *This kinde goeth not out but by fasting and prayer*. Where I calling it a *Secret ordinance*, oppose it to more euident places: you catch at the word, and

Deut. 29, 29 come vpon me with *Secret things belong onely to God*. He that should deale with you had neede, as the Lawyers in writing their instruments, rather haue twentie words to spare, then to want one. You would proue, *these words did onely belong to the Disciples, because the question was made by them, and the answere to them*. The Iayler in the

pag. 95. 96. 16. of the *Acts* sayd to *Paul* and *Silas*, *What must I do to be saued?* They answere him: *Beleeue in the Lord Iesus Christ and thou shalt be saued*, &c. Doth this Scripture now only belong to the Iayler, because this question was made by him, & the answer vnto him? Of

Matt. 17. 21 this kind be infinite other places. For interpretation of these words of Saint *Matthew*, I haue shewed you how I conceiue of them in your ninth Dialogue. Which exposition varieth somwhat from my former, not because I cannot maintaine it against any thing you obiect, but because I seeke after truth, and not after vaine iangling. If you can shew me any better, I will be readie also to change this. In meane season, vnderstand how I reason from hence for the perpetuall meanes of Fasting and prayer, which are mentioned by our Sauiour in this place, either as helpes to the extraordinarie and miraculous faith of the Apostles, or else of the ordinarie. But they are not mentioned as helpes to the extraordinarie: for miraculous faith in

Math. 7. 17. the least quantity, though no more then a graine of mustard seede

was

was able without these helpes to expell any diuell. Besides they could not be helpes to that, which in it selfe had no being. For the Disciples had vtterly lost their miraculous faith, else they had ejected the spirit. This also the word *Apistia*, *incredulity* doth note vnto vs. And an helpe is a conioyned force, which coniunction cannot be, where there is nothing to ioyne withall: and therefore they bee propounded in this place as helpes to the ordinary faith, and so to haue a perpetuall ordinarie vse, when like occasion is ministred to vs. Againe, euery Exception is a compendious speech, comprehending in it two propositions, as, *Except a man be borne againe, he cannot see the kingdome of God.* wherein is concluded also this, If a man be borne againe he can se the kingdome of God. So, *None can come vnto me except the Father draw him.* Euery one can come vnto mee, whom my Father draweth. Againe, *Except these abide in the ship, you cannot be saued.* If these abide in the ship, you can be saued. And so in all other. In like manner, *This kind doth not go forth, but by prayer and fasting.* This kind doth go forth by prayer and fasting. Now thē let men of iudgement determine whether here be not an euident confirmation of the ordinarie course of the Church in dealing after this maner: and whether it be not exceeding boldnesse, our Sauiour affirming in such sort as is declared. That this kind doth goe forth by prayer and fasting, for any to open his mouth licenciously against it, and to disgrace it by al opprobrious tearmes he can. From hence too you may see, the similitude drawne from the Physition saying to his patient, daungerously sicke of the Pleurisy, *You cannot liue, except you bleed*, was to good purpose, if you could iudge what is to purpose.

Ioh. 3. 3.
Ioh. 6. 44.
Act. 27. 31

It is too tedious to repeat all your vntruthes, your absurd *Non sequiturs*, and idle proses. As if *I thought it vnreasonable for Christ to reproue his Disciples negligence: if Christs answere were not proper to the Disciples, it was no answere: if he directed not his speech to the Disciples onely, he spake to no body present.* This mettal craues no touchstonne, it shewes it selfe by the eye what it is: therefore a knocke with an hammer is sufficient. So, *If this answere of Christ propounded an ordinance for al ages to come, there is an ordinance without an appointed subiect to vndergo the same.* Indeed this would be straunge for Accidents to walke alone without subiects. It is a difficult matter to finde who should be the subiect of fasting and prayer: so likewise too of the kingdom of God, which our Sauiour ordaineth to be sought in the first place, and food and rayment in the second, if we could tell who

pag. 99

Matt. 6.

should

pag.100. should do it. Besides, *succeeding ages that could expell this cumbersome diuel, should haue more power then euer the Apostles had*, which is false: for the Apostles, their faith not fayling, could expell any diuell. Further, *The Apostles should saile in not declaring this ordinance vnto vs*: concerning which ynough hath beene saide in the ninth Dialogue. Lastly, *it is no established ordinance in this place, because M. Darrell affirmeth, it hath beene an ordinance from the beginning*. I answere, I doe not referre the originall to this place, but onely the Confirmation, no otherwise, then I make Matrimony an established ordinance by our Sauiour Christ, he renewing the institution of it.

Math. 19 99
math. 12.27
Act. 16.13.

Againe. I argue the meanes of fasting and prayer from the example of the Iewes Church in our Sauiours time: wherin some did cast forth diuels, and yet were not in the number of our Sauiours Disciples, neither did it in his name. You answere, I *contrarie my selfe, affirming else where, they did it by the finger of God*: I reply, you do not contrary your selfe, but are euer like your selues, most absurdly concluding the selfe same working of the instrument, from the same maner of the principall agent: whereas the chiefe doer being the same, may and doth worke by the instrument diuersly. *Againe*, say you, *by mine owne confession, this ordinance as then was not established*. I answere, is was not so plainely, as when our Sauiour confirmed it by these words, yet in generall it was, and practised in the Church before. Moreouer, say you, *Those in our Sauiours time besides his Disciples cast out diuels by miraculous faith only*, for which you alleage the seuenth of *Matthew*. I reply, this scripture speaketh onely of the eiection of Satan, but sheweth not in what manner the same was performed, nor when. *We* do not leane vpon any *doubtfull vncertainties*, as you would Rhetorically declame, if ye knew how: neither do we *take the Lords holy name in vaine*, nor *pray without faith*: as you prate both without wit and conscience. I passe ouer your fooleries concerning K. *Wright*, & your sixe lies at one clap, contained in seuen lines, as I can proue to your shame. But what speake I of sixe, when I dare say there be sixe hundred leasings in your two volumes? VVe neede not take things of whole sale men by retale: it is an easy matter to know by your lying whose children ye are.

pag.101.
math.7-22.
pag.103.
ca.104.

That *Christs speech ought not to be appropriated to the Disciples*, hath beene declared. Neither do I *say and vnsay*, as you falsly charge me. The communication was betweene our Sauiour and his Disciples, but the ordinance there mentioned is common to all: yet *Physialogus* to fit these *variable answers*, as hee miscals them, doth tell vs a

pag.105.
106.

ta

tale of an Hermite, which comming to a Farmers house, and blowing his fingers to warme them, and his pottage to coole them, was put packing by the Farmer, as a dissembling companion. But to reuerse your tale, what if the like Hermit had come to some good mans house, and hauing on his face a faire shining visard with this *W.* written vpon it, should vpon occasion haue his visard slide off, and vnder it shewe another face, signed with *I. L.* Might not the good man iustly abhorre this double faced guest, and admonish all honest companie to beware of him? I will pardon you your sport at *fast and* pag. 107. *loose for a shilling,* though I might iustly make it sharper vnto you, then you would vnloose againe in haste. But where is the *contrarietie,* I pray you, *in making these words to bee spoken to the Disciples, and yet not onely to be vnderstood of them?* You would collect it after this manner, *Because that weaknesse of faith, and the kind of spirit were the two impediments, wherefore the child was not deliuered.* And that which is an impediment to anie, is also proper to the same partie, if we will beleeue your Metaphysickes. For you must needs deriue your Assumption from hence. As if the Israelites being shut out of the land Heb. 3. 19. & 4. 1, 2. of promise for their vnbeleefe, this impediment should bee so proper to them, that none but themselues should be excluded for the same: which absurditie is of that nature, that if your sticke of fast and loose were a good sound cudgell, you deserue to be well laboured about the shoulders with it. But what should I pursue your seuerall absurdities? To rake after such scatterers were to fill a cart, rather then ones lap. In briefe for your whole dispute, to proue *these words only to belong to the Disciples:* If incredulitie and omission of Matt. 17. 1. prayer and fasting were impediments onely to the nine Disciples, (for *Peter, Iames* and *Iohn* were not of this number) then they can be impediments to no body else. And so *Peter, Iames* & *Iohn* should cast out any kind of spirit notwithstanding the like incredulity, and omission of fasting and prayer. Yea all other Christians whatsoeuer should also in like manner. For what should hinder them, if they haue no impediment? And what impediment can they haue, these two being onely proper to the nine Disciples? See now how prouidently you tie *these words to the Disciples onely,* permitting larger power to all other Christians then to them. The contradiction you here charge me with is lame. It is palpably false, that I *pag. 49. of the Doctrine auouch, there are some kind of spirits, which the Apostles (with all their power) could not possibly expell, but by prayer and fasting.* Of this very errour I do by sundrie reasons from pag. 44. of the Doc-

 trine,

trine, vnto page 48. confute *Stapleton* and *Thyreus*, which notwithstanding you charge vpon me, & againe sticke not to say, that *Stapleton, Thyreus and my selfe agree herein*, so shameleſſe are you. But specially you make your ſelues merie with a cõtradiction, pag. 111. 112. I answere, The Disciples their not expelling the diuell out of the *Lunatike*, when they were destitute of miraculous faith, letteth not but that by miraculous faith they could expell any diuel. These I trust may agree together, without cutting the throat one of another.

That which you talke of *helping their weake miraculous faith by fasting and prayer*, is already answered. Further, I shewing that *fasting and prayer were not required as helpes in this place to miraculous faith*, pa. 113, &c. say, that *Miraculous faith is of that kind, which is giuen without means to certaine men*. whereupon it must needs follow, that there being an *Apistia* an vtter defect of miraculous faith in these Disciples, it was not to be recouered by fasting and prayer. You answere, *It was not begotten without meanes, because it was giuen by inspiration of God.* 1. *Cor.* 12, 9. By which you make the holy Spirit to bee a meanes: whereas a meanes is but an instrument: And the holye Ghost together with the other two persons of holie Trinity is alwayes a principall efficient. Thus you confound heauen and earth together, & make nothing in the world to be done without means: neither any thing in the world to bee more then ordinary: for whatsoeuer is done by the same vsuall and neuer ceasing meanes, must needs bee reputed ordinarie. There be few places in the fielde more replenished in the spring with stincking nettles and weedes, then your whole booke with such poyson full Hemlockes as these. But with all we haue a Discourse of an *Habituall & Actuall miraculous faith*: pag. 114. whereof the *habituall is begotten by the Spirit and the word*. Seeing therefore these causes cannot alwayes be effectlesse, and that they be euer working in the Church till the end of the world, it cannot be auoided but that Miraculous faith should be in the Church for euer: And the rather if we consider, what by your saying *miraculous faith is*: which you define to be nothing els, but *an vndoubted perswasion, by which we firmly beleeue, that there is nothing impossible to God*: But all the faithfull do vndoubtly beleeue this, and therefore we haue still *Miraculous faith* remaining amongst vs, and shal haue so long as the Church soiornes on earth: yea the very diuels beleeue this and so hauing miraculous faith, by your leaden rule shall bee workers of true miracles. I adde, they which were endued with the mira-

miraculous faith, had beſides the perſwaſion of *Gods omnipotencie*, an vndoubted perſwaſion of the will of God, for the effecting of the wonderful matters, which beſides or contrarie to nature they attẽpted for the good of the Church. Now for as much as the *knowledge and aſſurance of the ſaid will of God* is not to bee had from the *word*, therefore the written word is not the onely ground-worke of miraculous faith, neither doth it come *by the hearing thereof*, as you affirme. For *Actuall faith*, you will haue it *a ſpeciall motion from the ſpirit of God, raiſed vp extraordinarily*, whereby *the action of faith* ſhall not proceed from the *Habit* as from the next cauſe, as the action of iuſtice cometh from the habit of iuſtice, and ſo in all other qualities of that kind, but there ſhall be ſomething in Actuall faith extraordinarily more then was in the Habituall. If a man had your ſharpnes he might quickly go beyond *Actius Nauius*, that cut the whetſtone in peeces with his raſor. For *the increaſe of miraculous faith by means*, it is but needles to ſtand vpõ it, cõſidering we affirm an vtter defect therof at this time in the diſciples, not ſome couered ſparkes remaining in them, to be raiſed into flames by faſting and praier. For true miraculous faith how litle ſoeuer, is able without theſe helps, to atchiue her deſined worke. But then you will ſay, yea in effect do ſay, that *the Apoſtles did ſuperfluouſly ioine praier with it*. I anſwer, no more ſuperfluouſly, then the Church doth ioyne Sacraments with the word. Faith of it ſelf is ſufficient, to apprehend Chriſt vnto ſaluation, and this faith is begotten by the word: Yet Sacraments haue their neceſſary vſe, not to inable faith to that, which it could not without them, but to confirme and ſtrengthen it to doe her worke more cherfully, and with fuller aſſurance. Praier is the generall inſtrument to be vſed in all holy workes what ſoeuer: and therfore the Apoſtles had warrant for their praier, & were free from all will-worſhip therin. I omit here for breuitie fiue of your ſlanders, and two contradictions wherewith you charge me, my ſelfe being not author of any one of the contradictory propoſitions. pag. 116. pag. 117. 118.

I prouing that theſe wordes in S: Mathewe *this kind goeth not out*, &c. belong not peculiarly to the Diſciples, ſay, that *if our Sauiour had rebuked them for not faſting & praying, they might haue excuſed their want of time*, you trifle exceedinglye about this: at laſt you affoord vs this worthy anſwere; that *conſidering our Sauiours ſtaying in the mount* (which for all the circumſtances you can alleadge can not be long) *they had time ynough to pray*. *Antiquum obtinet Crito*, Matt. 17. 21. pag. 119. 120. 121.

you

you must run your old byas, & impudently slap vs in the mouth with time to pray, when the question is of time to fasting and prayer. Againe, you will haue these words, *This kind goeth not forth but by fasting and prayer*, to be no seuerall reason rendred by our Sauiour, why his *Disciples failed in their purpose*: whereas we haue shewed, it is a distinct thing from Miraculous faith, and not necessarily ioyned with it: and therefore not to concurre in making one reason with the

Pag. 122. same. Moreouer say I, *if the Apostles in each weaknes of this faith, must*

Pag. 123. 124 *of necessity haue betaken themselues to fasting and prayer, they should haue bene a whole day about a miracle: the exercise of fasting requiring this space, which would haue bene great hinderance to their speedy trauell ouer the whole earth.* You answere, *This is Iudaisme.* Belike also it is Iudaisme for Christians to pray; because the Iewes did so. But vnderstand, good Reader, that the practise only of such cereremonies as the Lord appointed to be a difference betweene the Iewes, and other people, is Iudaisme, not the exercise of such duties, as be common to both. That which you doubt *what should become of the other part of the day, if the diuell should be cast forth before noone*, beseemeth men which acknowledge no other seruice of God, but for their owne turnes. Is there no duty of thanksgiuing? no request for strength to the party dispossessed? no desire that the eye-witnesses might profit by it? you would haue Christians serue God, as the dog his maister for a bone. The rest is vnworthy to be repeated, & so was this, but that I would giue the Reader a taste. But what say you, that wil not haue a fast to continue *for a day to A. Walker, alias*

Pag. 125. *Io. Deacon*? who in a booke of his called *the Footpath to fasting*, saith, that *in the day of our fast, we must be exercised in hearing, applying, and praying for the remouing of God his iudgements, euen from morning to night*? Do I (you false tongues) in *pag.* 48. and 49. of the *Doctrine*

Pag. 125. say, that *the Apostles should haue stirred vp their weake faith by fasting and prayer*, when I spend those whole pages to proue the contrary? O palpable slaunder, and extreame impudencie! Likewise you say, I affirme else where, *The Apostles faith was so strong as it needed no meanes to stirre vp the same.* And I would tell you, you say vntruly, but that your skore is so full that now you be desperate. Of these two bastardly propositions, conceiued and brought forth by your selues, and not by me, you frame a *Contradiction*: saying therupon, that *I will turne, ere I burne, yea with the turning of an hand, turne the cat in the pan*: and then you tell my *pupils*, they *may be pestilent proud*

of such a turne-about tutor. Here wee may beholde, as your honest dealing with me, so your eloquence and modestie.

Besides, I auouching *the Apostles strong faith after Pentecost, able for miracles whatsoeuer, and therefore vnlikely the Lord should appoint a peculiar course for them, for so short a time as from his transfiguration till then:* you collect from hence *the weaknes of their faith till Pentecost:* which I graunt you, and more then that, namely, that their miraculous faith was vtterly extinct at this time. And therfore no vse of fasting and prayer for the extraordinarie work, but onely as it serued to the vsual maner of the Church in this case. But you wil proue *the apostles miraculous faith might faile after Pentecost,* because *their faith failed sometimes in doctrine and iudgement.* That we may vnderstand your meaning, what do you signifie by Doctrine? what by iudgement? Doctrine vsually is publike teaching and instruction: Iudgment priuate thinking and opinion. Did the Apostles erre in publike teaching? You saye, *The Apostles and bretheren which were in Iudea, thought the word of God was not to be preached to the Gentils.* You ground this out of these wordes, *And when Peter was ascended to Hierusalem, they of the circumcision contended against him.* VVho contended with him? The Apostles, say you, but without any warrant from the text. It seemeth *S. Luke* hauing mentioned the *Apostles* in the first verse, doth of purpose in the second vse these generall termes, *They of the circumcision,* to distinguish these contenders with *Peter,* frō the Apostles. It may be the Apostles did not yet so clearly vnderstand this mistery, yet it is not likelie they were in this case no more but equall to the weake brethren, whereby they should ioyne in contention with them. Grant we also an errour here, it was only in *iudgement,* not in doctrine. And as for *Peters not going rightly to the truth of the Gospell,* it was not error either in doctrine or iudgement, but a timorous dissimulation for the time. *Iohn his falling downe before an Angell,* was errour through sodaine passion, not proceeding from setled iudgement, much lesse auouched in publike teaching. Considering therefore these places proue not that *the Apostles erred in doctrine and iudgement,* and that the *Lord* doth principally promise that *the Spirit of truth should lead them into all truth: and bring all things to their remembrance which Christ had told them,* whereupon they be called *Skilfull Maister-builders,* and the Church is said to be *built vpon the foundation of the prophets and apostles.* It is admirable you dare so confidently auouch such an assertion, vpon so little or rather no warrant, and of so dan-

Act. 11. 2.

Gal. 2. 13. 14

Reue. 19. 10

Ioh. 16. 13 & 14. 26.

1. *Cor.* 3. 10.

Ephes. 2. 20.

gerous consequence. You childishly cauill at my speech, where I say, *Their faith did not faile them, after they receiued the holy Ghost in That fulnesse*: as if I had attributed such a fulnesse to the, as is not incident to a creature: and yet I expresly distinguish it by note of restraint *That fulnesse*, that is, such a plentifull measure as I had spoken of before. Such an one, as was said of *Stephen*, that *hee was ful of the holy Ghost*: and of *Paul*: and of *Elizabeth*, when shee brake forth into that heauenly salutation of the blessed virgin, *that she was filled with the holy ghost*. The same is said of *Zachary* when he prophecied, and of the Apostles, *that they were filled with the holy ghost*. And all these in the Concret, but in the Abstract without all limitation to haue the fulnesse of the Spirit, belongeth onely to a diuine person, the Father, the Sonne, and the holy Ghost. So that whatsoeuer person hath the simple fulnesse of the Spirit, the same is God, as well as hee who hath the fulnesse of the Godhead. Of Christ his fulnesse (to whom the Father hath not giuen his Spirit by measure) do all the elect receiue, not the fulnes it selfe, but grace for grace, that is, graces or gifts of the Spirit heaped vpon graces: euery one according to the measure of the gift of Christ, some euē vntil their cup runne ouer. All which discourse when at last you conclude, that *howsoeuer the Apostles were subiect to errour, yet they could not possiblie erre so long as they heard the voice of Christ: and but followed the onely directions of the Spirit of truth: And that they did neuer vniuersally erre: Moreouer, that they did neuer decline from the foundation it selfe*: & lastly, that *they were recalled from their errors*; what singular thing do you ascribe to the Apostles, that is not common to all beleeuers? Are not the Apostles to be preferred aboue all other Ministers of the Gospell, and beleeuers since their dayes? Yet you seeme to put them in the very same ranke. Nay, you say in the top of the same page, that *there be some Testimonies of the Apostles, which onely but slipped from humane infirmities, and that these (how glorious soeuer in shew) are not the testimony of Iesus, & therfore not the spirit of prophecie*. you speake here very daungerously, that I say no worse.

pag. 127. &c

Act. 7. 55. & 3. 9.

Luc. 1. 41.

Act. 2. 2. 4

pag. 133.

You argue *the defect of the Apostles miraculous faith*, from their *praying in working miracles*, which rather is an argument for the continuance of it. For if it had bin vtterly extinct, it had not bene to be obtained by prayer. but if you say Praver declareth the weaknes of it, and that you meane such weakneſse, as without prayer had not beene able to effect the worke, it is false, as hath beene oft re-

pag. 135.

Act. 4. 29 30. & 9. 40 & 28. 8

membred

vnto you: but if you take weakeneſſe for ſome leſſe meaſure of cheerefulneſſe, which had neede be ſtirred by inuocation of Gods holy name, I graunt you ſuch a weakneſſe, but this is too weake to ſtrengthen any whit your cauſe. you charge mee falſly in ſaying, I *denie that the apoſtles faith might & did faile before they were filled with the holy Spirit.* I know not how oft I affirme this, which you ſay *is the very point* I *denie*. Neither do I ſay, *it was but fortie dayes betweene Chriſt his transfiguration, and Pentecoſt.* I do wittingly let paſſe manie of your lies: it is a trouble to repeate them. you ſee *no inconuenience to approper theſe words, This kind goeth not forth but by faſting & prayer, to the Diſciples themſelues:* whereas if faſting and prayer had beene neceſſarie as helpes to their weake faith, that could not ſtand which our Sauiour hath immediately before affirmed, that ſo much faith as a graine of Muſtard ſeede ſhould be able to do the greateſt miracles. Howe this diſtinction of diuels is to be vnderſtoode, wee haue ſufficiently declared in the *Doctrine*. you make a wonderful partition, when you interpret *This kind*, only to diſtinguiſh *diuels from other creatures*. The nature of a partition is, that the thing which is parted ſhould be common to all the members. as in this place, *creatures going out* is the Generall agreeing to both the Specials, in this ſort. Of creatures that go out of man ſome are diuels, and they go not out but by faſting and prayer: ſome are of other kinde, and theſe of what nature ſoeuer goe out of a man without faſting and prayer. What, is man now become a cage for all creatures? Indeed the old Philoſophers had woont to ſay, that Man is a little world: but you will giue vs a ſenſible vnderſtanding of it, if horſes, beares and lyons, fowles, and creeping things of all kind, may haue an habitation in him. You haue beene ſo carefull all this while to free man from poſſeſsion of diuels, that in the meane ſeaſon you haue made him a forreſt to containe all ſauage beaſts in. I pray you what kind of creature doth lodge in your owne breaſtes? But you ſay, *This kind cannot be referred to the diuels amongſt themſelues, becauſe they be all of one kind as angels be, and alſo men.* Profoundly ſure: as if *kind* did onely note eſſence, and not ſometimes quality and condition. you brought vs euen now an example of *Ihrewes*, *The beſt of this kind is ſhrewiſh ynough: wherby* you ſaid, *women were ſeuered from men by their ſexe or kind.* Is difference of ſexe difference of Eſſence? So we ſpeake of deceitfull men, This kind of men is not to bee truſted: of flatterers and ambitious perſons, This kind of men ſpeake all to pleaſe thoſe in authority: of ſuch as haue made ſhipwracke of

Matt. 17.

Doct. pag. 48 46, 48

Doct. 49 *pag.* 136

Doct. p. 51.

pag. 137.

a

gerous consequence. You childishly cauill at my speech, where I say, *Their faith did not faile them, after they receiued the holy Ghost in That fulnesse*: as if I had attributed such a fulnesse to thē, as is not inci-
pag.127.&c dent to a creature: and yet I expresly distinguish it by note of re-
straint *That fulnesse*, that is, such a plentifull measure as I had spo-
Act.7.55.& ken of before. Such an one, as was said of *Stephen*, that *hee was ful*
3.9. *of the holy Ghost*: and of *Paul*: and of *Elizabeth*, when shee
Luc.1.41. brake forth into that heauenly salutation of the blessed virgin, *that*
Act.2.2.4 *she was filled with the holy ghost*. The same is said of *Zachary* when he prophecied, and of the Apostles, *that they were filled with the holy ghost*. And all these in the Concret, but in the Abstract without all limitation to haue the fulnesse of the Spirit, belongeth onely to a diuine person, the Father, the Sonne, and the holy Ghost. So that whatsoeuer person hath the simple fulnesse of the Spirit, the same is God, as well as hee who hath the fulnesse of the Godhead. Of Christ his fulnesse (to whom the Father hath not giuen his Spirit by measure) do all the elect receiue, not the fulnes it selfe, but grace for grace, that is, graces or gifts of the Spirit heaped vpon graces: euery one according to the measure of the gift of Christ, some euē vntil their cup runne ouer. All which discourse when at last you
pag.133. conclude, that *howsoeuer the Apostles were subiect to errour, yet they could not possiblie erre so long as they heard the voice of Christ: and but followed the onely directions of the Spirit of truth: And that they did neuer vniuersally erre: Moreouer, that they did neuer decline from the foundation it selfe*: & lastly, that *they were recalled from their errors*; what singular thing do you ascribe to the Apostles, that is not common to all beleeuers? Are not the Apostles to be preferred aboue all other Ministers of the Gospell, and beleeuers since their daies? Yet you seeme to put them in the very same ranke. Nay, you say in the top of the same page, that *there be some Testimonies of the Apostles, which onely but slipped from humane infirmities, and that these (how glorious soeuer in shew) are not the testimony of* Iesus, *& therfore not the spirit of prophecie*. you speake here very daungerously, that I say no worse.

You argue *the defect of the Apostles miraculous faith*, from their
pag.135. *praying in working miracles*, which rather is an argument for the con-
Act.4.29 tinuance of it. For if it had bin vtterly extinct, it had not bene to be
30.& 9.40 obtained by prayer. but if you say Praver declareth the weaknes
& 28.8 of it, and that you meane such weakenesse, as without prayer had not beene able to effect the worke, it is false, as hath beene oft re-

membred

vnto you: but if you take weakeneſſe for ſome leſſe meaſure of cheereſulneſſe, which had neede be ſtirred by inuocation of Gods holy name, I graunt you ſuch a weakneſſe, but this is too weake to ſtrengthen any whit your cauſe. you charge mee falſly in ſaying, I *denie that the apoſtles faith might & did faile before they were filled with the holy Spirit.* I know not how oft I affirme this, which you ſay *is the very point* I *denie*. Neither do I ſay, *it was but ſortie dayes betweene Chriſt his transfiguration, and Pentecoſt.* I do wittingly let paſſe manie of your lies: it is a trouble to repeate them. you ſee *no inconuenience to approper theſe words, This kind goeth not forth but by faſting & prayer, to the Diſciples themſelues:* whereas if faſting and prayer had beene neceſſarie as helpes to their weake faith, that could not ſtand which our Sauiour hath immediately before affirmed, that ſo much faith as a graine of Muſtard ſeede ſhould be able to do the greateſt miracles. Howe this diſtinction of diuels is to be vnderſtoode, wee haue ſufficiently declared in the *Doctrine.* you make a wonderful partition, when you interpret *This kind*, only to diſtinguiſh *diuels from other creatures.* The nature of a partition is, that the thing which is parted ſhould be common to all the members. as in this place, *creatures going out* is the Generall agreeing to both the Specials, in this ſort. Of creatures that go out of man ſome are diuels, and they go not out but by faſting and prayer: ſome are of other kinde, and theſe of what nature ſoeuer goe out of a man without faſting and prayer. What, is man now become a cage for all creatures? Indeed the old Philoſophers had woont to ſay, that Man is a little world: but you will giue vs a ſenſible vnderſtanding of it, if horſes, beares and lyons, fowles, and creeping things of all kind, may haue an habitation in him. You haue beene ſo carefull all this while to free man from poſſeſsion of diuels, that in the meane ſeaſon you haue made him a forreſt to containe all ſauage beaſts in. I pray you what kind of creature doth lodge in your owne breaſtes? But you ſay, *This kind cannot be referred to the diuels amongſt themſelues, becauſe they be all of one kind as angels be, and alſo men.* Profoundly ſure: as if *kind* did onely note eſſence, and not ſometimes quality and condition. you brought vs euen now an example of *Ibrewes, The beſt of this kind is ſhrewiſh ynough: wherby* you ſaid, *women were ſeuered from men by their ſexe or kind.* Is difference of ſexe difference of Eſſence? So we ſpeake of deceitfull men, This kind of men is not to bee truſted: of flatterers and ambitious perſons, This kind of men ſpeake all to pleaſe thoſe in authority: of ſuch as haue made ſhipwracke of

Matt. 17. 2

Doct. pag. 48 46, 48

Doct. 49 pag. 136

Doct. p. 51.

pag. 137.

a good conſcience, This kind of men groweth worſe & worſe. Now tell me, you *Anſwerers*, whether *Kind* will carie no other ſenſe but that, wherewith you cauill as beſeemeth freſh Sophiſters. Againe, it is admirable, you could find no other ſimilitude to declare the diſtinction of diuels by, but onely the *whole ſtate of this kingdom of England*, comparing our moſt gracious *Souereigne*, Gods Lieutenant amongſt vs (I tremble to ſpeake it) to the Prince of darkneſſe, and all the inferiour honourable orders of *Dukes, Earles, Lords, Iudges, Iuſtices, Knights, Gentlemen, yomen, &c.* to the lower ſort of diuels. Could any men forget themſelues ſo much, as that againſt all good maners, againſt honeſty, againſt Chriſtianitie, yea, againſt nature it ſelfe, which hath printed in the minds of ſubiects all loyall and reuerent reſpect towards their moſt worthy Soueraigne, and in the hearts of inferiours all dutifull regard of their honourable Superiours, that you ſhoulde vtter ſuch blaſphemie againſt Gods ſacred Miniſters, and ſo noble and ſo flouriſhing eſtate as this is? He that priuiledged this, deſerues hee ſhould priuiledge no more. You thought to lade your *Exorciſt* with the enuy of ſo odious a compariſon: but all wiſe men will ſee, your ſelues are the *Exorciſt*, and all the reſt of the perſons in your books, whom ye make to ſpeak what and how ye pleaſe: and therefore whatſoeuer they offende, they ought to be whipped on your backs. I take not vpon me to define of the *ſeuerall orders of diuels* further then the ſacred word of truth is my guide. You contrariwiſe, that you might oppoſe your ſelues againſt me, ſticke not to bend your forces againſt the verie Scriptures. For you will haue nothing now amongſt them, but a *meere confuſion, and a ſtate without all order*: notwithſtanding our Sauiour teacheth, that the power of darkneſſe is a kingdome: that there is a Prince of this kingdom called *Beelzebub*, and inferiour degrees called his *angels* (which whether they be all of them equall, or no without diſtinction or difference in any reſpect whatſoeuer, you ſhould haue conſidered from theſe words, *He taketh vnto him ſeuen other ſpirits worſe then himſelfe*, & not vainly to haue trifled about the word *Exuſia*) that there is a kind of policie of concord maintained amongſt them, whereby this kingdom is vpholden. Theſe things are plainly taught, and are ſuch as no Chriſtian may gainſay, yet you would ouerthrow all this, ſtriuing for ſuch a blended mingle amongſt them, as is vtterly void of any the leaſt diſtinction. But it is a true ſaying, Fooles whileſt they labour one euill to ſhun, into the contrarie preſently runne. VVhereas in theſe words, *This kind goeth not forth*

pag. 138

pag. 140. &c

Matt. 12. 25 &c. & 25 41.

but

but by prayer & fasting. I haue obserued foure thinges: *That there are two kinds of diuels: That one is more difficultly expelled then the other: that the child was possessed with one of the worser kind: that thence partly it was wherefore the Disciples cast him not forth*: you returne, *They which want arte to analyze the Scriptures, may here learne to be-butcher a text*, with Rhetorike ill beseeming vnmannerly clownes. pag. 154.

But tell me, is there no difference between *Analyzing*, and making collections from a text? Prate no more of the *extraordinarie faith of the Disciples*, except you can make it good by sound reason they were indued with such kind of faith at that time. Our Sauiour saith there was an *Apistia* in them, a thorough defect, wherby only they failed in that extraordinarie course they attempted. pag. 155

But now you wil shew *the impieties, absurdities and dangers which follow of this doctrine. First, it is impietie to avouch any thing for truth that is not.* I acknowledge it is a greate impiety: but this doctrine doth not so. Secondly, *Lying wonders are the marks of Antichrist.* I answere, you ly falsly, when you make the casting forth of Satan by payer and fasting to be a lying wonder. Thirdly, *it is impiety to affirme fasting and prayer (ex opere operato) may effect such a worke.* It is impietie indeed, but you may as truly charge me with this affirmation, as you might charge any sound hearted Christian that knowes *M. Deacon*, with affirming, that he is an honest man. Fourthly, *it is impiety to prophane prayer and fasting without warrant from the word.* We graunt also this, but withall ioyne vnto it. That it is no lesse impietie to call that prophaning of prayer and fasting, which is warranted by the word, as in this case it is. Lastly, *it is impiety* (say you) *to make prayer and fasting which of God are appointed to bee helpes vnto faith, a sole meanes without faith for expelling of diuels.* I subscribe vnto it, and wish with all my heart, that he which saith so may receiue the reward of a deceiuer: but if such cogitation was euer farre from my breast, that such impudent slaunderers might be branded in their forehads with this marke: *False accusers of their brethren.* I doubt not but you haue read these words of the *Discouerer*, (who neuer speaketh vntruly for mee, whatsouer hee doth against me) *M. Darrell confesseth the necessitie of faith in the ordinarie means.* Your *absurdities* (for so they are indeed) with the *daungers* partly foolishly, & partly falsly imagined, what should I vouchsafe to repeate them? I will leaue these and such like to the Reader, able now by that which hath beene saide, for all your maske to discerne you. pag. 157. 158 Disc. pa. 43

pag.159. You vpbraide me *with hiding my selfe for feare of perill.* I haue learned by the commandement and example of Christ Iesus himselfe, his Apostles, and of the Martyrs in all ages, that I may, nay, ought to giue place to the rage of man, especially not forsaking in the meane season any duty that concernes me. Yet that you may know I am not cleane runne away, by that time you haue read my *Survey* and this *Reply*, tell me whether you haue not met with some bodie to cope with in the field. You will not allow Christians, *if they*

pag.160 *perceiue not their first endeuours to preuaile, to betake themselues to further humiliation*. whereas this is the practise of the Saints, as to continue their supplications till the Lord haue graunted, so to increase their exercise, the more difficult they proue the Lord to be. First,

2. Sam. 12. 16, 17. *Dauid* besought the Lord for his child, & as it may seeme without fasting: then not obtaining, he ioyned fasting and watching withall: thirdly, he continued the like till the seuenth day. Did hee intend a seuen dayes fast in the beginning? Concerning the *efficacie*

pag. 161. &c, *of prayer and fasting*, we haue the same Coleworts sod againe. You talke, as if *I made prayer and fasting for dispossession, an vnwritten ordinance*: whereas I onely suppose, that if it were not expresly set downe, yet for that it is to be collected out of the generall places of

Isa. 22. 12. Scripture, as where the Lord doth summon vs, in the day of our affliction vnto weeping and mourning, to baldnesse and girding with sackcloth: and to call vpon him in the time of our aduersitie, and such like: and because also by experience we proue it to be effectuall, this were sufficient warrant to vs for the ordinance of God in this behalfe. You might therefore haue spared your paines in prooving *the sufficiencie of the worde of God*, till you mette with some Papist, in which number I thanke the Lord I am not.

pag. 167 For your demaunds, *If dispossession be now ordinarie, what be the things ordinary in it.* To satisfie you (though you litle deserue it) for the *medicine*, I answere it is fasting and prayer: the *operation*, is the mightie power and will of God, apprehended instrumentally by our faith: *the ministeriall hand to apply this medicine*, is the assembly of Christians gathered for this purpose: *The theorie or skill to directe this hand*, is the knowledge that they bee warranted in so doing from the worde of God: *the meanes to imprint this skill in those physitions breasts*, are the meanes of knowledge, hearing, reading, meditating, *the habit of this skill* is their faith, which is more confirmed by the often practise of the Church in all times. Nowe then, if you cannot see what is ordinary in this worke, bewayle your ordinarie

blindnesse,

blindéſſe which will not ſuffer you to behold the truth. That which followeth is no leſſe fooliſh then falſe, which you talke of *faiths working ex opere operato*: as alſo that *faſting and prayer cure by way of miracle*: that *faſting and prayer is no ſupernaturall maner of cure*: & that *if it be ſupernaturall, then it is extraordinarie*. Is it poſsible for men to dote in this manner? But if the light that is in men bee darkneſſe, how great is their darkneſſe? pag. 168 Diat. 6.

To the teſtimonies of ancient & later writers alleaged by me, you anſwer firſt, that *I wreſt open their mouths, and make them ſpeak what I pleaſe*. It is true, they ſpeake what I pleaſe, becauſe in this matter I ſpeak nothing but what pleaſeth thē. but you inſinuat that I peruert them. If you could haue ſhewed one ſyllable this way, al the world ſhould haue heard of it. Beſides, you haue already teſtified in your former *Diſcourſes*, that they ſpake, as I report thē. Secōdly, you ſay, *they ſpeake nothing at all to my purpoſe in hand*. My purpoſe in alleaging them was to ſhew, firſt, that men in theſe dayes may be diſpoſſeſſed of diuels. Secondly, that faſting & prayer haue bene vſed by the moſt learned and godly in the Church from time to time, ſince miracles ceaſed, for expelling of Satan out of the poſſeſſed. Nowe whether they ſpake to theſe *purpoſes* or no, becauſe your ſelues haue loſt your eyſight, let others that can iudge of colours ſay what they thinke. Your third anſwere is, that *I haue not their owne examples or practiſe, but only their bare reports concerning the practiſe of ſome others cōuerſing among them*. This likewiſe is vntrue. *Tertullian* and *Cyprian* recken themſelues in the number of them which did expell diuels. And *Chryſoſtome* was preſent in the congregation, and preached two ſeueral dayes at leaſt, when publike prayers were made for expelling of Satan out of perſons poſſeſſed, brought to that ende into the Church at the commandement of the Deacon. And therefore wee haue theſe three mens *practiſe*. But admit that none of them had made mention of their owne practiſe, might not their iudgment & counſell *that feruent prayers are to be vſed for the healing of the poſſeſſed* ſuffice? ſpecially ſeeing diuers of them adde, that *they haue knowne ſome that haue beene healed by the prayers of the godly*. Fourthly, ſay you, *they giue their aduiſe for the exerciſe of prayer alone*. And this is your fourth lye, for ſome of them mention prayer & faſting. Thus much for reply to your generall anſweres, let vs nowe heare thoſe which be particular. To *Origen* you anſwere, that *he inſinuateth simply the ſuppoſed efficacie of faſting and prayer, but putteth downe no practiſe of it as of a perpetuall ordinance*. Marke how falſe lyers faulter in their ſpeech. Dect. 58 pag. 169.

ſpeech. Did *Origen* ſuppoſe ſuch an efficacie of faſting and prayer & yet not thinke it was Chriſts ordinance, and to bee vſed? Whence could it haue efficacie, but from Chriſt? Or to what purpoſe was efficacie, if to no vſe? He therefore that acknowledgeth the lawfull efficacie of faſting and prayer, doth alſo acknowledge, that there is an ordinance of faſting & prayer to ſuch an end. *Tertullian* you ſay, *Speakes of manie pretended deliuerances from Satan, but ſheweth not the maner how they were freed from them.* What? doth *Tertullian* in his Apologie of Chriſtianitie againſt the Gentils, to the whole ſtate of Rome, alleage certaine counterfeit deliuerances from Satan, to countenance Chriſtian religion with? Doth he vſe ſuch policie in writing to the Gouernour *Scapula*, to gaine credite to the profeſſion of the Goſpell? Surely you are either not well in your wits, or which is worſe, you haue for filthy lucres ſake conſpired to make but meere fables of the great works of God. *But he ſheweth not*, ſay you, *the maner how they were delivered.* Do you ſticke at this matter? you will not haue it by miracle in any ſort: and therefore, ſay wee, by faſting and prayer. Nay but, will you ſay, if it were at all, it was by Miracle, and Miracles were ceaſed before his dayes. Therefore ſpeake plainely, and tell *Tertullian* to his face that he lyes, that hee deluded the world with his *pretended deliuerances*. This is your meaning: and this anſwer would be ſhort. How *Cyprian* is to be vnderſtoode, *we ſhall know* (ſay you) *by Iames Pammelius, who telleth vs, That the Exorciſts office was not then in anie vſe of the church, becauſe that office being ioyned with the gift of Miracles, did continue but for a time.* I do not alleage *Cyprian* for the office of Exorciſts, but for the caſting forth of diuels in thoſe dayes, which he teſtifieth plainly, ſaying, *And the diuels by tormen's of words are caſt out of bodies poſſeſſed.* To this adde, if you will *Pammelius* his teſtimonie, *that miracles were then ceaſed*, and ſo we conclude, That there were caſting forth of diuels in *Cyprians* time, & yet not miraculous. But yet for *Iames Pammelius* let me tell you thus much: wheras you alleage his words *for the ceaſing of Exorciſts before that times* and alſo that a little after he ſhould ſay, *That the craſts and iugling ſleights of counterfeit Exorciſts & coniuring prieſts, they are long ſince apparantly euident: yea euen to the very eyes of the blind:* I maruelled greatly to heare theſe words of *Iames Pammelius*: I knew he affirmes the cleane contrary, maintaining ſtrongly by teſtimony of Antiquitie that office of Exorciſing both of Spirits poſſeſsing, and in Baptiſme. I turned my *Cyprian*, but I could find no ſuch words of his. And therefore either

Cyp. Epiſt. 55 & 76. edit. pammel. Antuerp. in adib. Petri Bellei 1589

you

you haue met with an edition later then the last, or els you are as notable in belying mens writinges as the most shamlesse Papist of them all. To the rest, as *Chrysostome*, *Peter Martyr*, *Kemnitius*, *Phil. Melancthon*, *Beza*, *Vogellius*, *Daneus*, *Chassanius*, all of them most plainly testifying dispossession, and that by meanes of fasting and prayer, you answere not one word, but for the lenght of their footinges, referre vs to that which hath beene spoken of the former. Indeed these treade in the steps of the former, and of all the godly learned that went before them & therfore by them we may gesse their footings: and so likwise by your three witles answers to the three former we may easily gesse what would be your answere to these, namely all the absurd shiftes you could deuise to elude their testimonies, as not hauing in purpose to find out the truth, or to yeild to it beeing found, but by hook and by crook to maintaine your owne giddy fancies, whatsoeuer eyther Scripture, or any other shall saye against it. What doe I therfore disputing with such companions, which make not truth their end, but some other peruerse respect, I know not well, what? Surely Christian Reader, that which I do is for thy good, to laye open vnto thee their vnconscionable iuglings, least by any coloured pretences thou shouldst be beguiled by them. Did not I well to bind thē to their good behauior by a publike Instrument in their *Discourses*? Thou seest they haue not one worde of truth to say against the practise of the Church of God from the Apostles time till now. But you are weary o these authenticall witnesses and therefore betake your selues againe to your wōted reasonings, where you may haue more scope of words, and more hope to darken the truth.

If, say you, *prayer and fasting bee an established ordinance, then it should be alwayes effectuall.* I answere, yow haue dome bring an *If* but there is a lye in the end of it. The prophet complayneth, *How long Lorde wilt thou hide thy face for euer?* Because *Dauid* obtained not by his sute his sonnes life, he might by this rule haue bid prayer and fasting adue. Infinite are the instances: it is meruaile you could meet with none of them, to cause you to hold in so grosse an vntruth. But I crie you mercy, you meane effectuall in regard of vttermost issue, not of the present time. Now then frame your reason. *The ordinance of god is alwayes effectuall, prayer & fasting is not allwayes effectuall, & so not god his ordinance in this case.* I answere. if you take *Effectuall* for the last issue and such helpe as is expedient. you say vntruly of prayer and fasting: If you meane *Effectuall* for

pag. 170.

2. Sam. 12. 18

pag. 171, 172, 173.

O[illegible] sensible

ſenſible, imagined and preſent helpe, then is it as falſe, you ſay of gods ordinance. And this if you mark it, will ſuffice for all you prattle about this matter. So likewiſe, how *Diſpoſſeſſion now is no miracle* pag. 174. 175 enough hath beene ſpoken, except you can bring vs ſomething of more weight, then hitherto you haue done. Further obſerue that here they ſpare not to denie (though in as couert tearmes as they can) the witneſſe of *Tertullian, Cyprian, Chryſoſtome*, and of al the reſt before alleaged, or that can be. Moreouer, if this will not ſerue, for compendiouſneſſe ſake, and more ſecuritie of their cauſe, they deny the concluſion. The argument is, *If diſpoſſeſſion by prayer and faſting be miraculous, then Tertullian, Cyprian, Chryſoſtome, and others wrought* pag. 176. *miracles, when they expelled diuels after this ſort: but this is falſe: and therefore the firſt.* To this you anſwere, *Secondly, if it be true that heretofore or nowe Spirits bee expelled by ſole prayer and faſting, then is the worke a miracle:* which is the contrarie affirmation to the concluſion. *When* pag. 177. you talke of *ſole prayer and faſting*, you haue a ſecret meaning of your owne of ſole prayer without faith. Concerning which I tell you again, that if *M. Walker* & you haue ſuch a kind of prayer and ſuch a kind of faith, as vſually are ſeparated one from another, you may do well to diſpute of ſuch matters betweene your ſelues, for my part I allowe no ſuch prayer, neither doth the Church of God.

You argue, *that diſpoſſeſſion is not by hiſtoricall or temporary faith,* pag. 179. *becauſe God hath appointed it to miraculous faith*: which thing if it had beene proued in the beginning, we had done long ſince. Further, you ſee not wherein *iuſtifying faith ſhould be far better then Temporarie, if this doth caſt out diuels*, as if to caſt out diuels out of the bodies of men, were all in all. Beſides, *if hiſtoricall faith be ſufficient, diuels might caſt out diuels.* But what if they will not? you are neuer a whit the nearer. Such trumperie ſhal haue no other anſwere. For anſwere to your fourth reaſon I ſay, a reprobate may apprehend the mercies of God the Creator, but not of God the Redeemer, And ſuch apprehenſion for the eiecting of Satan may ſuffice.

You ſlaunder me, when you ſay, that in *diſpoſſeſſion of Sommers we purpoſely prayed to teach the beholders, that the worke was effected* pag. 182 *by the onely power of him to whome we put vp our prayer.* But what is it to ſay you ſclander me? You make no more account to ſclander pag. 183. me, then to fillip me. Againe I doe not ſay, that *parties bewitched* 184. 185 *haue no warrant from the Scripture to faſt & praye*, (as is apparant in the place by you quoted, where I counſell them to this holy exercise) but only, that ther is not ſuch expreſſe mention in the word for

for the curing of them, as for parties possessed. And therefore all that is an idle dispute which you purpose for diuers pages together in this matter. You would faine haue me a companion in this wicked assertion, which your selues maintain as is apparant afterwards. pag. 186
But note (good reader) for an egregious blasphemy, that these *Answerers* make the Lord guiltie of the horrible sins committed by the wicked *in seeking to the diuell for help* in their miseries. For how doe they proue it to be *an absurditie to condemne peoples going to the diuel for helpe?* Surely thus, *If it be a sinne to seeke help of the diuel, we shall make the Lord guiltie of this sin with whom it cannot be done.* Thou seest what blasphemie this proposition containeth: for it plainly affordeth that which before I say. And the Conclusion, to wit, it is no sinne to seeke helpe of the diuel, is a conclusion of monstrous impietie. So where they would proue, *There is no warrant from the worde for prayer and fasting to be vsed in behalfe of parties bewitched,* pag. 188.
there argument is of this sorte. *If there be no warrant from the word that sole prayer & fasting haue any power of themselues ex opere operato, to remoue supernaturall iudgements of God, then there is no warrant for parties bewitched to vse fasting and prayer as helpefull in this case. But the first, say they, is true, & therfore the second.* But what do you sticke at parties bewitched? You should haue inferred generally, there is no warrant nor vse of fasting and prayer at al for any thing *ex opere operato.* O men stroken with the blindnes of Sodome which before the dore, seek the dore, and cannot find it. Is it your foolishnes, that you cannot tell what you auouch? Or your shamelesnes, that you passe not though your names should be deseruedly odious to all? Or is it, that you do so far despise all the learned of this land, that you thinke there is not one man able to discearne such prodigious falshood. Such wretched persons would rather be confuted with a three corded whip, then by the writinges, or wordes of any. And if that will not serue, it were meete such order might be taken with you that the Church of God sustaine no damge by you.

Whether I haue so fondly trauersed this question *of possession* as you say, I leaue it to the godly learned to determine, to whose censure I willingly submit my selfe both in this & in al other my writings. But as for your iudgments I passe not. First make it appeare, you haue eyes in your owne heads, before you take vpon you to tell what is straight, or croked in me then sanctifie your mouths by confessing, your lyes, your sclaunders, your blasphemies, before you giue sen pag. 190

tence

tence of any my doings. In the mean season, if you will needs be barking, I will find such a bone for you to gnaw on, as shall bee fit for your chaps,

91,192 Concerning the *counsell I gaue for fasting and prayer*, it was grounded from hence: *that in all iudgements* (of which kind possession is) *we are called to humiliation*, for which I cite in the margine an induction of diuers examples. To which you answere first, *that without particular knowledge of the iudgement, prayers could not be made in faith to remoue it*: which is one of those Axioms that neuer fails you, such an one as *Ahabs* prophets were inspired with, whē they counsel led him to warre against *Ramoth*. Shall not the poore countrey sicke man pray to God for some comfort in his distresse, because he doth not know particularly the nature of his disease? Secondly, that the *quoted Scriptures onely testifie the peoples humiliation by prayer and fasting, so oft as any strange iudgement was inflicted, but proue not essentiall possessions and dispossessions by those means*. yet they proue the counsell I gaue was warrantable, and this I content my selfe with. It is enough if my poore premises afforde mee one naturall and orderly conclusion at one time. Euery mans Cow can not bring forth colts as yours do.

pag. 194. 195. 196. To conclude, you tell vs *your great confidence in the cause*, which no man needs to doubt of, if he consider your former arrogant boldnesse: nor much maruell at as strange, if he call to minde your vncredible blindnesse. But if your learning and conscience were more, your confidence would be a great deale lesse. Then you inferre of the premises, *That if there be no possession, nor dispossession nowe by fasting and prayer, how greatly they haue erred that haue auouched it, and how much they are to be blamed which cannot endure it should be impugned*. But contrariwise say I, if all these things be true, which you denie, as hath beene prooued by stronger reason, then you possibly withstand, what doe you deserue which haue troubled the Church with newe and singular opinions in these points, and in broaching them, haue offered to the world to choke them withall other verie many grosse, fantasticall and impious absurdities? and yet you dare intitle your fooleries, *The infallible truth*, and such, as *Glory & praise is to be giuen to the Lord for these his lately reuealed counsels by you concerning these intricate questions*. O intolerable proud ignorance! Haue you by *late reuelation* cleared these intricate questions? Indeed your assertions be late for they were neuer heard of in the Church before: but they were neuer reuealed vnto you by the Spirit of truth,

but

but by that lying ſpirit, whoſe image doth liuely appeare almoſt in euery argument you handle. And yet that my ſelfe be not onely iudge, let any man of vnderſtanding waigh with equal balance that litle that hath beene *replyed*, & compare it with yours, & then giue ſentence: whether any ſince the time of our peace by our gratious Queene, profeſſing the goſpell, hath publiſhed any writing of diuinitie that doth come neare theſe your treatiſes in number of vnſound potions, in miſconſtructions & wreſtings of Scriptures, in abſurd collections, in impudent reiecting the authoritie of the ancient, in ſhameleſſe pretending the names of good authours againſt their owne meanings, in childiſh ſtumbling in the firſt rudiments of Arts, in moſt frequent lying and ſlaundering, and which is greateſt of all, in dangerous and ſcandalous aſſertions mixed with ſome notorious blaſphemies: and then it may be you ſhall carie the bell of al that haue written in our times. Great cauſe there is we ſhould all make bonefires for the publiſhing of your bookes, or rather of your publiſhed bookes: but eſpecially *M. Biſhop*, who got the priuiledge ad *imprimendum ſolum*, I beleeue he beſhrewes your fingers for it.

A REPLIE TO THE THIRD DIALOGVE.

YOur *Vſes* are ſutable to your doctrine. For what other thing can proceede from a Cockatrices egge, then a ſerpent? Yet *Lycanthropus* admires and applaudes them: and ſo perhaps may ſome doe, that be not well in their wits. But they which haue receiued the annointing, that teacheth vs concerning all things, will abhorre your prodigious dotage, and the more when they conſider your vſes, which manifeſt plainly that your errours be not about ſtrawes and ruſhes, ſuch as without danger might be contemned and neglected, but which draw after them moſt perillous conſequences, mightily ſhaking the verie foundation, and chiefeſt pillers of our faith. You pretend that this *your doctrine of finall determination of poſſeſſions & diſpoſſeſſions of Spirits and Diuels*, affordeth firſt, *an holy meditation concerning the vndoubted faithfulneſſe and truth of our eternall God, in that he promiſing four thouſand years fully before, to ſend the ſeed of a woman, which ſhould bruiſe the ſerpents head, hath in his owne determined* 1. *Ioh.* 2. 27.

termined time fulfilled the same, by sending his sonne. We beleeue and know it, that not one iote of the Lordes promise hath failed, but doth your doctrine yeeld any confirmation of it? Nay verily, but doth vtterly ouerthrow it, and make the Lord of truth to haue falsified his word. The Lord hath promised by sending his sonne fully to subdue and vanquish Satan: your doctrine doth teach vs, that Christ by his death hath onely made an end of possessions and dis-
91, possessions of diuels, that is, that he hath only deliuered *Demoniaks* such as were actually tormented in their bodies by the Diuell. What? Are all the Elect Demoniakes? Haue you not taught vs, that Possessions were very rare before Christs time, and that it was verie probable there were none at all in Israel, till a little before his comming, and none after the Apostles? Are only then these men deliuered by Christs death? You haue quit the Lord indeed wel of his promise. He promised the breaking of Satans head, you make that Christ hath scarce pulled one lock of haire frō his head. He promised deliuerance for al his elect, you restrain this deliuerance only to men actually possest with diuells. He promised vs a gift, as it were of an hundreth thousand talents: you make him to haue satisfied his promise in bestowīg vpon vs an hūdreth pence. Do men satisfy bondes in such manner? Doth a Creditor, to whome is owing a thousand pound, hold himselfe contented in receauing two or thre shillinges? fye vpon your comfort: you are miserable comforters.
pag. 1 But this determination, you say, of Satans *Actuall possession may*
195. *confirme faith and hope for the vtter subuersion of the whole kingdom of darknes.* I answer, you ly falsly, if your doctrine be true. For hope can expect no more then faith doth presently imbrace, but by your teaching, faith doth not imbrace a ful vanquishing of satans kingdome by Christs death, but onely an end of Actual possessions (which neither was accomplished, as hath bene shewed) and therfore hope cannot looke for any further subuersion of Satans kingdome then is alredie. Now let the godly iudge what lyeth hiden in your doctrine, whether they be things to be tolerated, and cooly dealt in or no: or rather of such nature, that if you will not reclaime them, all louers of the truth ought to spit in your faces in detestation of your errours. So likewise when you speak of God his al sufficiencie, of Christs triumph, and of the Diuels captiuitie, who so euer trusts to your doctrine in these poynts, shall perceaue he leanes vpon a staffe of reede, which when hee shall stand in neede of it will breake a sunder, and run through his body, as may sufficiently

y be ſeene by this little, that I haue nowe remembred, as alſo by that hath beene more fully declared, in Suruey of your Sixt Dialogue. your vſes then are wretched, and therefore I leaue them.

The proper vſe that can be made of your doctrine is, that Chriſtians ſhould now ſhew their wiſedome in practiſing that rule our Sauiour Chriſt hath taught them, namely this, *beware of falſe prophets which come to you in ſheepes clothing, but inwardly they are rauening wolues.* Thou haſt ſeene in this book of theirs, good Reader, theſe men profeſſing themſelues, *The Lord his vnworthieſt on earth*: when they beginne their diſputations, to begin the ſame with prayer, recreating themſelues with ſinging of *pſalmes*: to wiſh the *Reuerend brethren if they haue faulted either in matter or manner to confute them and ſpare not, withall* deſiring *the bleſſing of God to light on their heads for their labour that way: to haue* vſed many *wordes of goodly pretence, of great obedience to the* magiſtrate, of great care of their brethrens good, of great ſyncerity in calling euery thing to the triall of the Scripture, and many ſuch other faire ſhewes. On the other ſide thou mayſt ſee by this *Suruey* and *Reply* what abundance of vile and groſſe errors is packed vp in theſe their treatiſes, What litle conſcience they make of god his truth, Of lying & ſlandering, how exceedingly they haue trifled in each ſeuerall poynt, and now by theſe vſes how all tendes to this, to deſcredit God his truth in fulfilling his promiſe, to impeach his ſufficiency for vanquiſhing of ſatan, to reſtrain Chriſts triumph to a thing of nothing, to limit Satans captiuitie with looſing of a skonſe, and ſuch like: which thinges beeing thus, now it will ſhortly and eaſily more appeare, whither theſe men be falſe prophets, or no. For if they ſhal recant themſelues of their errours, and as they haue giuen publike ſcandall to the Church, in labouring to draw men after their fancies, ſo againe in ſubmiſſion to the truth, diſclame all ſuch opinion diſſonant from the ſacred word, throwing the firſt ſtone at themſelues, to the end all other may beware of them, then they ſhall be manifeſted haue toſlipped but of infirmitie, and to be ſuch indeed, as they would ſeeme. Otherwiſe if they will ſtill maintaine & defend them, then thou ſeeſt good reader, theſe mens ſheepes clothing, and how for thy ſake I haue pulled it ouer their eares, wherby thou mayeſt behold them to be inwardly rauening woules: if they be to be iudged wolues, not only which rent the mẽbers of our bodies in ſunder, but alſo & much more they, which by infecting men with peſtiferous opinions, deliuer thẽ to ſatan to be

Matb. 7. 15

In the ſubſcription to three of the Epiſtles.

Dial Diſcou pag. 7, 262 Epiſt. Dedi. Anſ.

tor-

torne in peeces both bodies and soules: In this case it will behoue the Christian Magistrate, both Ciuill & Ecclesiasticall, to take order, that such cruel deuouring beasts may be driuen from Christs fold: & that they would consider, that they make not dissensions & scandales contrary to the doctrine we haue learned, which stand for the truth, but they which oppugne the truth. It is the rebell that makes ciuil war: the faithful subiects wepons are not against the peace but for the peace, neither is it the dog barkīg in the night, that disquiets the shepheardes, but the Wolues approching: the kepers stirring is to be commended, & the theues assaulting he is to be defended. This vse then the Magistrate is to make of your doctrine: generally all the Christians of this land, are to take it as a watchword to auoyd you as Scorpions, that they may know you to be men,

3.19. which haue made your bellies your god, & to glory in your shame:

m.3.5. 16. which haue a forme of godlynes & haue denied the power of it, whose mouthes speake proude things, hauing the persons of men in admiration for aduantage sake. These manner of men are fortold should come in these last dayes, & our Church doth already feele it by lamentable experience. If thou shalt make this vse, Christian reader of their booke it shall not bee altogether vnprofitable for thee.

17. 11.19 For *It must needes be that heresies should come, that they which are approued amongst vs may be knowne.* The Lord therefore strengthen vs so many as be of this number, to stand for his truth, and giue vs

19. wisedome to discerne those which would craftily vndermine it, that all such wicked workers beeing defeated, wee may constantly walke in the puritie of it, till the day of our Lorde Iesus Christ, to whom, with the father and the holy Spirit be all honour and praise for euer.

Amen.

FINIS

The *Discoursers* charging me with a shamfull companie of *Contradictions*, no lesse then fiftie, I first framed an answere to them, with full purpose to publish it, & therein haue made it plaine there is not a contradiction. But this my Treatise prouing much larger then I intended, & the answere to them being of litle or no vse, saue only to cleare my selfe of this slaunder, and to discouer their filthinesse, which needeth not, I thought good rather to suppresse, then publish it: yet so as I will giue thee, good Reader, a taste thereof, and of their vpright dealing herein, assuring thee of my credit, that euen such be the rest of their contradictions. *contradictions .13.*

Darell, say they, *in his* Doctrine *pag. 54. saith, that prayer and fasting being vsed aright, will certainly prosper either to the remouing or sanctifying of the iudgment. But pag. 56. he saith, their is no assurance to preuaile.* *Answere.*

I answere. There is no assurance to preuaile, that is, *we can not be sure the partie shall be deliuered, the meanes being vsed*, for so are my wordes. Had then I sayd *pag. 54. fasting will certainlie prosper to the remouing of the iudgement*, and no more, I had contradicted that I say, *pag. 59.* but adding *or sanctifying*, a child may see here is no contradiction. Such a contradiction is this: Certenly the *Discoursers* wil either be ashamed of their contradictions, or their sinne is the greater: Assuredly they will not be ashamed of their contradictions. And this: The sun is either vnder a cloud, or set. It is not vnder a cloud. *contrad. 23.*

In his Detection 163. Darell saith, fire hath power to burne, & in the same pag. hath no power to burne.

All that we reade *Detection* 163. is that *Somers hand being in the fire was not burnt.* Would euer any man, these two excepted, hence collect *a contradiction*? How many thousands in this land haue said the same, and among them not a few that be learned, & yet I dare say neither learned, nor vnlearned euer feared they spake contraries. *Shadrach, Meshech*, & *Abednego* being in the fire were not burned, and yet they that cast them into the fire were burnt. I trust you wil not say here is a *contradiction*. But confesse both these to be true. Fire naturally burneth, but restrayned by God the ouer-ruler o nature, it doth not burne. Secondly, you should first haue shewed where I say, *Fire hath power to burne*, before you told vs that I speake contraries. *Answ.*

contrad. 24. *In his* Dotrine *pag.* 2. *he saith, that it suteth altogether with Satans nature to be filthie or wicked in speech. But* Detection 175. *he saith, that it sutethe as well with his nature to vse good and holy speeches.*

Ans. My wordes *Detection* 175. *be, Holy wordes haue beene vttered by Satan.* Tel me is this a false proposition? Or yet this: *vncleane and blasphemous speeches sute excellently with the nature of the vncleane Spirit.* If both these be true, which none will deny, with what truth doe you say that I speake *contraries*, whereof the one must needs be false? These men sure had forgot when they doted of this *contradiction*, that the diuel is as well by nature subtil, (and in his subtiltie *ready to transforme* him selfe into Angel of light) as vncleane and wicked. Of this stampe they haue 18 contradictions more.

contrad. 11. *In his* Doctrine 47. *He saith the disciples by vertue of their so large a commission could cast out a deuil of any kinde. But pag.* 50. *the Lunatike child was possest with one of the worst kinde of spirits, and that thence it came the disciples could not cast him out.*

Ans. To make this *contradiction* they haue *detracted* part of my words in either proposition. In the former these, *if their faith failed not*: which words, or words to the same effect in the aforesaid *pag.* 47. & the two *pages* precedent I vse no lesse then twelue times. In the latter proposition where I say, *thence partly it came*, they *detract* this word *partly*: wherby I intimate the Disciples faith did at that time faile them, when they could not cast the diuel out of the lunatike child, so that their incredulitie was one let, which oft els where I expresse. And this you well knewe, as appeareth by your next *contradiction*, the twelft I meane. What meant you then thus to separate and rent asunder those words which of purpose I had coupled together? And by *detracting* that which in either of the propositions is so materiall, and in the one I *inculcate* so often, to pretend a contradiction where you knew none was? Who hath bewitched you to vse such cursed deuises, for the compassing of your contradictions? A cursed pretence must this needes be, seeing it can not be done in ignorance. For you cannot be ignorant hereof, that the wordes detracted by you I vsed, specially those so oft iterated, and that in those *pages* from whence yee haue the saide contradictorie proposition: considering also that to make another contradiction you alege the very same words you omit here, & that frō the same page, as witnesseth the contradiction here following. Neither can you be ignorant of this, that these wordes being vsed and added by me, I am not contrary to my selfe, yea hence it is that you did

omit

omit them. It must needes therfore be that you knowing here was no *contradiction*, haue against that knowledge of yours (by this deuise of *detracting* these words) made yet a faire shew to the world of a contradiction. Here is no contrarietie except these be propositions contradictory: *The Disciples could cast out a diuell of any kind, if their faith fayled not: The Disciples their faith failing could not cast the diuell out.*

In his Doctrine 47. *he saith the Apostles faith failed not: But pag.* 48 *he saith it failed at this time when Christ spake to them and in this very worke.* contrad, 31.

These wordes, *the Apostles faith failed not*, you could omit when such omission serueth for your purpose, as appeares by the former contradiction. But now when they must stand you in some steade, they are not to seeke. *He* wanteth the vse of one of his sences, that smelleth not here your stinking breath. My wordes be these. *They were able to cast out al diuels, if their faith fayled not*: which imply not *that the Apostles faith neuer failed them*, as you would haue it, for otherwise here is no contradiction, but rather the contrary, that their faith did at some times faile them. Again, though these words *The Apostles faith failed not*, with the former are mine, yet thus rent and separated from their fellowes, I may truly say they are not mine. In your *Discourses* you say, *if the skies fall we shall haue larke*. By your wise rule you there affirme, that *the skies do fall*: & in the 5ie booke *pag.* 24. where you haue these words: *If Angels be vncreated, then are they eternall*: you affirme, that *Angels be vncreated*: yet *pag.* 28. you say *Angels be created*. These propositions be contradictorie, and the former of them absurd, and so here is a contradiction (forsooth) and an absurditie, when indeed there is neither. Here is paltrie and childish stuffe. If I would walke but in this one crooked step of yours, how easily could I make a booke of your *contradictions*, and another of your absurdities. But suppose I had said no more then you produce. vz. *The Apostles faith failed not*: frō thence ye could not inferre a contradiction, except I had spoken of the same time mētioned in the latter contradictorie proposition. Their faith might not faile them at one time, and yet faile them at another time. Answ.

In Doctrine 52. *Abrahams prayer is made a sole meanes of conception and procreation of children. But pag.* 60 *another meanes is found appointed of God for that purpose, or els it would proue a miracle.* contrad, 15.

As before by detracting, so here by adding you abuse both mee, and Answ.

and the Reader: The words I vse be these *Who will deny but that as the sinne of Abimilech (in taking Sarah, Abrahams wife vnto him) had shut vp euery wombe of the house of Abimelech, so the prayer of Abraham was the meane whereby they were opened, & that iudgement taken away?* Do I here make *Abrahams prayer a sole meanes of procreation?* That I meane & affirme is, that by *Abrahams* prayer as a meanes *Abimelech* his wyfe & women seruants, were made able to conceiue, which before they could not, not excluding, but including the knowlege and seede of man: which no man in his right minde would hence gather, this couple excepted

Contrad, 46, *In his Doctrine pag. 2. he saith, it is absurd to affirme that the diuel (being without a man) can dispose of the whole or any parte of mans bodie: but Detection, page 11. he saith that the diuel (in all probability) did vse Sommers his tongue, notwithstanding he was essentiallie and sensiblie playing boe peepe vnder the coverleed.*

Ans, The former proposition is not mine. *I say euery part*, you saye, *any part*. And so by *altering* a word you haue made *a contradiction* where none is: except there be no other part of *Sommers* his bodie, besides his tongue.

And thus to thee Reader, but for breuitie, I would make it euident, that of the *discoursers* fiftie contradictions, being examined one by one, there is not so much as one to be found. The greater is their sinne and shame who chraged me with so many.

And here we are to obserue first, that of these contradictions there are aboue 20. wherin there is no contradiction at all, taking them at the hucksters hand, euen as the nselues haue quoted them. And namely these: contradiction 4.6.7.8.13.14.17.18.19.21..23.24.26.28.31.35,38.36.37.41,& 45

Secondly, to marke the seueral deuises or sleights whereby they make semblance of contradictions when there are indeed none if you take the words as they be set downe in my treatises. This semblance they make.

1 By *forging* that I neuer affirmed (but often the contrary) as in contradiction 1.9.17.19.20,23,25,26,27,35,& 46.

2 *By omitting* or *detracting* some worde or words matetial, as *in contradiction* 3.11,12,25,27,30,31,33,36,39,& 40

3 *By adding*, and thus haue they done in contradiction 15.43. & 47.

By

4 By *altering*, as apeareth by contradiction 6, 17, 27, 29, 49

5 To this said end also, when both their contradictory propositions are in the same *page*, and sometimes in the very same sentence, they runne notwithstanding for the one of them to a *page* far off, or happelie to another booke: Hereby (I meane by alleaging two distinct pages of mine, somwhat also asunder) pretending, that what I say in one place, forgetting forsooth my self, I gaynsay in another. As appeareth by contradiction 1. 3. 5. 22. 26. 36. 42. & 47.

Thus haue these men so accustomed and taught themselues to falsifie my writings in whole or in part: by *forging*, *detracting*, *adding*, & *altering*, as they haue alleaged very litle of mine truly: & no marueil: because truly alleaged they would not make for their purpose Yet notwithstanding they haue by these cursed meanes compassed their *contradictions*, I doubt not but that they please themselues greatly, and glory in them, specially in the great number of them, and doe thinke therein they haue shewed not a litle wit. But I will tel you, a very foole that will giue libertie to himself to *adde*, *detract* and *alter* but here & there a letter, may easily make a thousand *contradictions*, where none are: much more he that wil do thus by wordes & sometimes by sentences, as you haue done.

VVhether now you haue *pretermited any thing materiall*, and by such *omitting*, and *taking what parte of my writings might make most for your purpose, euen purposely maymed my writings*, which you deny and I affirme, iudge thou indifferently betwene vs good reader. And whether you will *acknowledge* and *redresse the offred wrong*, whereof I complaine, and which I trust to be a *wrong* I haue made manifest by this my *Replie*, vnto all men, & to your owne consciences, as you pretend you will, nay, seeme to abhorre not to do it, if once the *wrong* shal be made to appeare, saying: *God forbid that we should not doe it very willinglie*: in time both thou and I shall know. And thus much for answer to their supposed *contradictions*. For breuitie sake I omit my reply to the *Absurdities* wherewith you charge me, and your slaunders conteined in them. *Ans. Epist. to the Reader fol. 4*

Here not vnfitly may I charge you with the *contradictions* & *Absurdities* I find in your writinges. and if it fall out so that your selues be found faultie in that, wherof vniustly you accuse another, then thereby learne henceforward to plucke rather the beame out of your own eyes, then busie your selues so much about lesse then a mote in your brothers eye.

In their *Answere* page 55 and page 179 of their *Discourses*, they say, that *the manifestation of Christ his deitie, and declaration of his glorious Gospell, were the maine ends of possession*: and a little after, that *the possession of diuels were especially for these two ends*. therby insinuating that there were some other ends or end. Yet page 67 of the same booke they say, that *these were the two only ends of this wonderfull iudgement*.

2 In their *Dial. dis.* page 58 they say, *angels doe euermore worke after an inuisible, insensible, and spirituall manner*. And the next leafe, page 60 they say, that *angels in all their ambassages they do either manifest themselues by seeing and hearing, or assist vs ofttimes by some other sensible means*. And they bring *Augustine* flatly affirming that *the angels do outwardly helpe vs by certaine visible apparitions or sights, which they propose and offer before our eyes*.

3 In their *Discourses* pa. 42 they say, *the mind it selfe, and it only is that whereby motion consisteth: and the body is but the minds organon or instrument, hauing naturally in it selfe no motion at all, or no further motion at the most, than for those only actions wherin the said mind (whose organ it is) employeth the same*. But in pag. 74 of the same booke they affirme, that *the body it selfe hath, and may accomplish or effect corporall operations and motions by it selfe alone, without anie the direction, moderation, guidance, or consent of the soule*.

4 In their *Discourses* pag. 116 they say, *the diuell did so bewitch and charme the Serpent, as that (through his craftie suggestion) shee was very wel able to propound such a diuination or soothsaying, as did presently circumuent or deceiue Euah*. And in the same booke page 119 they say, that *a reasonable speech cannot possibly bee framed or vnderstood of anie but of a mind hauing vnderstanding and reason*.

5 In their *Answer* pa. 50 they say, *These eight demoniakes might be possessed, though the diuell was not essentially inherent in anie one of their bodies*: But page 43 of the same booke they say, *The possession of diuels whatsoeuer is ceased long since*.

6 In their *Discourses* 173 they say, *The Apostles might authetically auouch for infallible truth whatsoeuer they preached*. But in their *Answere* page 126 128 129 130 they say, that *the apostles sometime failed in doctrine*. And a little after: *all these were their errours in doctrine and iudgement*. And againe. *It was expedient for the apostles to erre in some things*, that is, some points of doctrine. And this they vn-

vnderstand after the holy Ghost fell vpon them, as is plaine by the aforesaid pages.

7 In their *Answer pag.7*, they say, that *wonders and miracles are flatly confounded*: but in their *Dialogicall discourses* 209, they say, *the deuel may worke wonders, but can effect no miracles.* and *pag.* 310, thus, *A thing effected by essentiall meanes, howsoeuer it may be a wonder, yet no miracle in any respect.*

8 In your *Discourses pag.* 352. *for your parts you assure me, that you are very farre from all suspition of a precompacted confederacie betweene Sommers and me.* Yet in *page* 42. *of your answere* you say, *Why should we wonder at all, that two cunning companions* (Meaning *Sommers* and my selfe) *confederate together before, should conclude such a course betweene themselues, as the one (by the helpe of the other) should progni-sticate strange and incredible events.*

9 In pag. 39. of their *Discourses*, they tell vs. *There is not a sicke sound Diuine that doth vnderstand Possession as they doe, and none as I fondly imagine* and yet in the Epistle to the Reader prefixed before that booke, that which they deliuer *concerning possession and dispossession of deuels*, they call, *their priuate opinion*: and in page 195 of their Answere, *The Lord his lately reuealed counsels.*

Part of their absurd and vnsound Positions

1 God by good Angels may effect fantasticall, vaine, and filthie effects *Answere* 15.
2 Good Angels may effect vaine and filthy effects. ibid.
3 Whereseeuer the Scriptures speake of Angels or deuels, they speake only by metaphore. ibid.
4 The Deuel hath no desire to be in any mans body. *Ans.* 22
5 The Iewes in Christs time did (partly) know the parties which were possessed, from the often reuelation of the parties themselues. *answ.* 32
6 God by his Spirit instructed the Cananitish woman (mentioned *Matth.* 15, 22) of her daughters malatie. *answ* 33
7 The manifestation of Christs deitie, and the confirmation of the Gospell, the only ends of Possession *answ.* 67
8 Christ hath put a finall end to the possession of deuels by his death and resurrection. *answ* 66
9 The supernaturall actions or effects of the Deuel in Demoniaks, cannot possibly be comprehended by humane senses. *Ans.* 69

10 The working of miracles was only in Christ and his Apostles dayes, *answ.* 90

11 God hath appointed plowing and sowing for a meanes of abundance or barrennes vpon the ground, *answ* 172

12 Good angels do euermore worke after an invisible, insensible and spirituall manner, *Dialogical discourses* 58. This is to bee refuted by all those places where angels are said to haue appeared and spoken in visible formes vnto men.

13 The body hath, and may accomplish by her selfe alone, corporall actions and motions, without anie her soules direction, moderation, guidance, or consent, *Dial. disc.* 74

14 The dead carcasse of a man, or the body being separate from the soule, may and doth also effect corporall actions and motions. ibid.

15 The Diuel did so bewitch and so charme the Serpent, as that (through his craftie suggestion) shee was very well able to propound such a diuination or soothsaying, as did presently circumuent and deceiue *Euah*. *Dial. disc.* 116. Absurd, that the Diuell should not onely thus make the Serpent it selfe to speake, but also argue the matter like a reasonable creature

16 The apostles erred in some points of doctrine, after the holy Ghost fell vpon them: Yea, it was expedient for them so to erre *answ.* 126, 128, 129, 130

17 It is verie erronious for anie to imagin, that the eyes may possibly be deceiued, in discerning betweene spirits (that is, bodies assumed by spirits) and true naturall bodies. *Dial. disc.* 157. You forget that *Abraham* and *Lot* were deceiued, as appeareth by *Gen.* 18. and 19.

FINIS

I am to craue thy patience good Reader, specially the authours, for the late comming forth of this booke: for I confesse it hath layen in my hands almost this halfe yeare.

10 The working of miracles was only in Christ and his Apostles dayes, *answ.* 90

11 God hath appointed plowing and sowing for a meanes of abundance or barrennes vpon the ground, *answ* 172

12 Good angels do euermore worke after an invisible, insensible and spirituall manner, *Dialogical discourses* 58. This is to bee refuted by all those places where angels are said to haue appeared and spoken in visible formes vnto men.

13 The body hath, and may accomplish by her selfe alone, corporall actions and motions, without anie her soules direction, moderation, guidance, or consent, *Dial. disc.* 74

14 The dead carcasse of a man, or the body being separate from the soule, may and doth also effect corporall actions and motions. ibid.

15 The Diuel did so bewitch and so charme the Serpent, as that (through his craftie suggestion) shee was very well able to propound such a diuination or soothsaying, as did presently circumuent and deceiue *Euah*. *Dial. disc.* 116. Absurd, that the Diuell should not onely thus make the Serpent it selfe to speake, but also argue the matter like a reasonable creature.

16 The apostles erred in some points of doctrine, after the holy Ghost fell vpon them: Yea, it was expedient for them so to erre *answ.* 126, 128, 129, 130

17 It is verie erronious for anie to imagin, that the eyes may possibly be deceiued, in discerning betweene spirits (that is, bodies assumed by spirits) and true naturall bodies. *Dial. disc.* 157. You forget that *Abraham* and *Lot* were deceiued, as appeareth by *Gen.* 18. and 19.

FINIS

I am to craue thy patience good Reader, specially the authours, for the late comming forth of this booke: for I confesse it hath layen in my hands almost this halfe yeare.